Appendix A: List of people and organisations contacted directly

**Residents’ groups**
(email or letter)
Apsley Road Residents Association
Barton Community Association
Central North Headington Residents’ Association
Central Ward Residents Association
Co-ordinating Committee of Headington Residents’ Associations (CCOHRA)
Divinity Road Area Residents Association
ENGAGE Oxford
Feilden Grove Residents Association
Friends of North Hinksey
Friends of Old Headington
Friends Of Quarry
Friends Of Quarry & Trinity Road
Friends of Iffley
Harberton Mead Residents’ Association
Hayfield Road Residents Association
Headington And St Clements Residents’ Associations
Headington Community Association
Highfield Residents’ Association
Hill Top Road Residents’ Association
Hinksey Park Area Residents Association
Hobson Road Group
Horspath Residents Association
Horspath Road Residents’ & Tenants’ Association
Iffley Fields Residents Association
Jack Straw’s Lane Association
Jordan Hill Residents’ Association
Moreton Road Residents’ Association
NAG Abingdon Road
NAG Barton
NAG Blackbird Leys
NAG Cowley
NAG Cowley Marsh

**Individuals/organisations on Planning Policy database**
(On database having requested to be contacted by letter only)
Mrs MM Smith
Mrs S Wernberg-Moller Councillor G Royce
Dr JJ Smith
Mr GD Lemmon
Mistress CAF Moir
Mr A Hazledine
Oxford Urban Wildlife Group
Mrs Twamley
Mr Jaggar
Mrs M Finch
Ms Y Paterson
Diamond Cottages Residents Association
Mrs D Woods
Ms T Walton
Mr and Mrs Payne
Mr V L Barnish
Ms P Wright
Oxford Consumer Group
Mr D Townsend
Ms A Adcock
Mr H Flower
Ms S Williams
Ms P Webber
Mrs J Couling
Mr and Mrs B Campbell
Mr T Gardner
Mr JP Drewett
Mr KJ Blay
Ms V Brewer
Mr C Catron
Mrs CD Martin
Ms M Pilgrim
Mr NA Croad
Mr H Lindsay-Cashmore
Mr J Cashmore
Mrs A Hutson
Mr M Barrington-Ward
Mrs M Mellor
Mr J Upton
Mr P Napier
Mrs H Henning (letter returned to sender)
Mr P Finnemore
Ms P Lanchbery

**Staff of the following major employers**
(a notice was placed on their intranet potentially reaching all their employees – approximate number of employees stated many of which could work or live in Oxford)
BMW (3,725)
Oxfordshire County Council (16,000)
University of Oxford (10,000)
Oxford Radcliffe Hospital NHS Trust (7,900)
Oxfordshire Mental Healthcare NHS Trust (1,500)
Oxfordshire PCT (1,700)
Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (1,200)
**Other groups local to Oxford**
(email or letter)
- Bartholomew Road
- Allotments Association
- Barton Fields Allotment Association (email bounced)
- Beckley & Stowood Parish Council
- Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
- Blackbird Leys Parish Council
- Bus Users UK (Oxford Group)
- Cherwell District Council
- CPRE Oxfordshire
- Cripple Meadow Allotment Association
- CYCLOX
- Dr Evan Harris
- Elsfield Parish Council
- FOXCAN
- Friends of Bury Knowle Park
- Friends of Cutteslowe and Sunnymead Park
- Friends of Holy Trinity Church
- Friends Of Iffley Village
- Friends Of Warneford Meadow
- Garsington Parish Council
- Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council
- Green Party Oxfordshire
- Headington School
- Horspath Parish Council
- Iffley Fields Community
- Nature Plan Group
- Kennington Parish Council
- Kidlington Parish Council
- Littlemore Parish Council
- Low Carbon Headington
- Low Carbon West Oxford
- Ms N Blackwood
- New Marston Wildlife Group
- Old Marston Parish Council
- Oriel College (Estates Bursar)
- Oxford Archaeology South
- Oxford Area Bridleways Association (British Horse Society)
- Oxford Association of Hotels and Guest Houses
- Oxford City Cyclists
- Oxford City Right to Ride
- Oxford Consumers Group
- Oxford Green Belt Network
- Oxford High Street Business Association
- Oxford Inspires
- Oxford Ornithological Society
- Oxford Pedestrians’ Association
- Oxford Sports Council
- Oxford University Land Agent
- Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society
- Oxfordshire City and County Archaeological Forum
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Oxfordshire Playing Fields Association
- Park Town Trust
- Ramblers Association
- Rare Plant Group Of Ashmolean Natural History Society Of Oxon
- Rescue Oxford
- Risinghurst and Sandhills Parish Council
- Roadwatch
- Sandford on Thames Parish Council
- Somerville College (Finance & Estates Bursar)
- South Hinksey Parish Council
- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Southfield Golf Club
- Stanton St John Parish Council
- Summertown Riverside Group
- The Inland Waterways Association (Oxfordshire)
- The Story Museum
- The Theatres Trust
- Town Furze Allotments
- Vale of White Horse District Council
- Voice of Oxford Climate Action Lobby (VOCAL)
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Wolvercote Against Masts
- Wood Farm Community Centre
- Wood Eaton Parish Council
- Wytham Parish Council

**Hard to reach groups**
(email or letter)
- Acorn (MIND)
- African Caribbean Community Action network (ACCAN)
- African Caribbean Youth Project (email bounced)
- Africol UK (email bounced)
- Age Concern Oxfordshire
- Age UK (Anchor Court, Barton Lunch Club, Cutteslowe/North Oxford, St Francis Court, The Clock House, Wood Farm) (Wood Farm letter returned to sender)
- Anjuman Khawatee-e-Pakistan
- Asian Cultural Centre
- Asian Youth Project
- Bangladeshi Association Oxfordshire
- Bangladeshi Welfare Association
- Barton Young People’s Centre
- Blackbird Leys Young People’s Centre
- Caribbean Catholics in Oxford
- Christian Life Centre
- Church Of England
- Church of God’s Prophecy
- Commonwealth House Community Development Network
- Cutteslowe Young People’s Centre
- Daybreak Oxford (Rosewood)
- Daybreak Oxford (The Limes)
- Deaf Direct Oxford
- Diocese Oxford (email bounced)
- Divine Project
- Happy Place Day Centre
- Indian Union
- Jayed Association
- Jehovah’s Witness
- Jewish Friendship Group
- Matrix Saxon Centre, Headington
- Muslim Welfare Group
- Nepalese Community Oxfordshire
- Oxford Access Forum
- Oxford Afghan Community

**Oxford Association of the East Timor Community**
- Oxford Community Churches
- Oxford Detached Team
- Oxford Irish Society
- Oxford Malayalee Club
- Oxford Malayalee Club
- Oxford Multi Cultural Action Group
- Oxford Options Resource and Wellbeing Centre
- Oxford Quakers
- Oxford Sikhs
- Oxford Swahili Community
- Oxfordshire Association for the Blind
- Oxfordshire BME Community Champions
- Oxfordshire Chinese Community & Advice Centre
- Oxfordshire Kurdish Women’s Group
- Oxfordshire Mental Health Matters
- Oxfordshire Transport For All
- Oxfordshire Unlimited
- Pakistan Welfare Association
- Restore
- Riverside Centre
- Rose Hill Young People’s Centre
- Roshi Asian Women Association
- Sikh Community Association (letter returned to sender)
- St Peter’s Church
- Wolvercote
- Sudanese Community
- Tamil Association
- The Union Street Centre, East Oxford
- Udayan (email bounced)
- Victory Revival Christian Centre
- West Indian Day Centre
- Wolvercote Young People’s Centre
- Women of Colour
- Wood Farm Young People’s Centre
- YWCA England & Wales
- Zimbabwe Community Group of Oxford
Individuals/groups on the City Council’s online consultation portal
(www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation) people on database at 5th and 22nd Nov 2010)
A J Schiff
A Kelsall
A. M. Hughes
Abi Hehir
Adam Pyke
Adele Timbs (2 emails)
Adrian P Butland
Adrian Treloar
Adrienne Hopkins
Alisa Homfray
Alan Dearden
Alan Foulikes
Alan Fraser
Alan Jones
Alan T Ludlow
Alastair McCullough
Alex Stonor
Alexander Thomas (email bounced)
Ali Provan
Alison Baxter
Alison Birch
Alison Byrnes
Alison Maloney
Alison Mary Wffen
Alison Mitchell
Alison Rosemary Julier
Alison Shlugman
Alison Wright
Allison Dalton
Alun Ward
Amy Poole
Andrew Lewis
Andrew Lund-Yates
Andrew Maguire
Andrew McDonald
Andrew Myatt
Andy Gray
Angela E Wood
Angela Worral
Angie Goff
Aniko Veres
Anita Ellen Fisher
Ann Edmunds
Anna Davidson
Anna Declerck
Anna Grieve
Anna Mary Brunton
Anne Gwinnett
Anne James
Anne Orgée
Anne Ridgway
Anne-Marie and John Temple
Annie Allsebrook
Annie Tysom
Antonia Bance
Antonia Mansel-Long
Ashley Goodall
Audrey Saunders
Barbara Jacombs
Barbara Jane Mercer
Barbara Latham
Barbara Marks
Barbara Mary Tarle
Barbara Minchin
Barbara Naylor
Barrie V Tollerson
Barry Crossman
Barry Sheldon (2 emails)
Bart Ashton
Beatrice Ray
Ben Gosset
Berenece Anderson
Bernadette Lavery
Bernard Johnson
Beverley Jane Hazell
Brenda Jarman
Brian Foster
Brian John Hamilton
Brian Lester
Bridget Bayden
Bridget Eley
Bridget Jennings
Bridget Taylor
Briony Ryles
Bryan Woolford
C Thorn
Carlly Farrell
Carmelle Bell
Carole Crane
Carole Elizabeth Robinson
Caroline Chanides
Caroline Longman (West Waddy ADP) on behalf of Ruskin College
Caroline Notcutt
Catherine Barnes
Catherine Dobson
Catherine Jane Ferrett
charles Lochrane
Charles Rodney Stableford
Charlie Seaward
Charlotte Frizzell (2 emails)
Chris Breward
Chris Brewer
Chris Coghill
Chris Dunabin
Chris Goffey
Chris Lee
Chris Miller
Chris Rich
Chris Wardley
Christa and Nigel Laird
Christian Smith
Christina Schmalenbach
Christine Cox
Christine June Westbury
Christine Nicholls
Christopher John Thomas
Christopher Pattison
Christopher R Taylor
Christopher Sharp
Ciara Fagan (2 emails)
Claire Potter
Clare Sander
Cliff Jordan
Clive Anthony Bristow
Clr Ruth Wilkinson
Colin Cook
Colin George
Colin Reid
Colin Whittle
Councillor John Goddard
Craig Rossington
Curt Lamberth
Dale Lloyd
Dalibor Warburton
Dan Clarkson (2 emails)
Dan Williams
Dani Quinn
Daniel Palman
Daniel Sharp
David Acton
David Antony Clover
David Clark
David Coates
David Coon
David Fyson
David Gieveson
Davidoughton
David Scroggie
David Ullathorne
David walker
David Wedd
David Woodman
Dawn Sedman
Debby Forbes
Deborah Ann Arnfinsen
Deborah Ceadel
Derek l Barson
Dick Wolff (2 emails)
Donald Marshall
Donna Dixon
Douglas Hale
Duncan Greenwell
Edward Lawrence Surridge
Edward P Parker
Edward Williams
Elisabeth Brain
Elizabeth Fisher
Elizabeth Godin
Elizabeth Mills OBE
Elizabeth Sheppard
Elspeth Gourd
Emily Crane
Emily Dartnell
Emma-Lisa Shiells
Enid Foster
Eorann Lean
Eric Sidebottom
Eveline James
Federico Caprotti
Felicity Steadman
Fern Judget
Fiona Floate
Fiona Hedges
Fiona Herd
Fiona Robertson
Frances Farrer
Frances Henderson
Francesca Bown-Wilson
Frank Dann
Frank Nawn
Fredric W Taylor
G.L.Adams
Gabrielle Colling
Gareth Bevan
Garry Curran
Gary Brimson
Gary Bryant
Geoffrey Best, FBA
Geoffrey John Sutton
Geoffrey Mills
George Ellwood
George Lambrick
Gillian Marsh
Giuseppe Damiano
Giuseppe Zanre
Glynis Mary Phillips
Gobion Rowlands
Gordon Woods
Graham Allison
Graham Jones
Graham Lovelock
Graham Paul Smith
Graham Stratford
Greg Barnes
Guy Greaves
Gwen Devine
Gwilym Hughes
H Cecil!a Twinch
Hadrian Matthews
Hamara Plume
Hannah Cole
Harriet Fishman
Harris Khan
Harry Edwards
Harvey Pitt
Heather Armitage (2 emails)
Heather Creese
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Heather Hamill
Helen Adcock
Helen Gee
Helen Lynch
Helle Christensen
Hilary Burr
Hilary Grime
Hilary Lappage
Hilja Bassett
Howard Watkins
Hubert Allen
Hugh Jaeger
Huw Mellor
Ian Ashcroft
Ian Humphries
Ian Michael Caws
Ian Moodie
Ian Scargill
Irene Louise Kirkman
Ivon Shaun Asquith
J Flawn
Jack Brougham
Jackie Ingram
Jackie Mundell Perkins
Jackie Owens
James Abell
James Cracknell
James Edwards
James Ian Dawton
James Lawrie
James Plunket
James Styring
James Wickham
James Winnett
Jan Bartlett
Jan Penrose
Jane Curran
Jane Henderson
Jane Ivimey
Jane Magpie
Jane Wafer
Jane Winfield
Janice Mouldsade
Jason Arneil
Jayne Saberton-Haynes
Jean Fooks (2 emails)
Jean Irene Bincliffe
Jennifer Carr (2 emails)
Jenny Ayres
Jeremy Dawe
Jeremy Flawn
Jeremy Thorogood
Jessica Rowan
Jill Fenton
Jim McGinlay
Jo Bullock
Jo Emmett
Jo Fowler
Jo Hunter
Jo Lyon
Jo Roadknight
Joanna Hazel Williamson
Joanna Norton
Jock Coats
John Charles Gittins
John Coyle
John Cropper (email bounced)
John Dykes
John Goddard
John Hugh Deason
John Irvin
John Leighfield CBE
John Lowe
John Mathias
John Rawson
John Reeves
John Roper
John Sear
John Seward
John Tranter
John William Nisbet
Jon Appleton
Jon Fletcher
Jonathan Best
Jonathan E Hood
Jonathan Gittos
Jonathan Nash
Jonathan Walton
Joyce Ann Day
Juan Carlos Conde Lopez
Judith Argles
Judith Harley
Judith Thomas
Judith Webb
Judy Chipchase
Julia Carragher
Julie Carlin
Julie Van Onselen
Juliet Blackburn
Juliet E A Field
June Chapman
Junie James
Justinian Habner
K A Spencer
Karen Brading
Karen Crossan
Karen Spiller
Kate Lonsdale
Kate Stratford
Kate Warrington
Kate Wilson
Kateherine E Coldwell
Kath Jackson
Katherine Ann Coldwell
Kathleen Ann Chicken
Kathryn Evans
Kathryn Johnson
Kathryn Nikjoo
Kathryn White
Katie Doorley
Kay Hare
Kay Herlihy
Kaylee McEntaggart
Keith Birnie
Keith Dyke
Keith Raymond Waller
Ken Groom
Kenneth George Lovesy
Kerrie Gaughan
Kevin Paul Barber
Kevin Willcox
Kieron Keeble
Kim Pickin
Kirsty Kelso (email bounced)
Kit Villiers
Kumar Sivakumaran
Laura King
Laura King
Laura Ross
Laurence Charles Colman
Laurence Eldredge
Lee Carter
Lee Scott
Lena Haapalahiti
Les Allen
Lesley Nesbitt
Lesley Papper
Leslie Wills
Linda Kimber
Linda O’Hanlon
Linda Peach
Linda Phillips
Linda Polik
Lindsey Watts
Ling Sung
Lionel Russell
Lisa Bowden
Liz Greenlaw
Liz Greenlaw
Liz Taylor
Liza Denny
Lorna Logan
Lorraine Wild
Lucinda A Ferguson
Lucy Cherry
Lucy Murfett
Luke Plummer
Lynda Humphreys
Lynne Hooper
M Hudson
M T Power
Madelyn Brewer
Malcolm Hope
Malcolm Walker
Maltbys the Bookbinders
Mansur Laljee
Marcus Tobler
Margaret Booth
Margaret Erskine
Margaret Maden
Margaret Warland
Mari Girling
Marie Vickers
Marilyn Cox (2 emails)
Mark Abraham
Mark Jennings
Mark Lygo
Mark Oxbrow
Mark Pitt
Mark Shearmarke
Martin Brodetsky
Martin Hobley
Martin Lyons
Martin Sutton
Mary Hodges
Matt Morton
Maurice Holt
Mazz Image
Meg Jones
Michael Bellew
Michael Bidmead
Michael Daniell
Michael Harker Tait
Michael Hill
Michael John Gibbard
Michael John Pickering
Michael Rouse
Mike Bellew
Mike Billson
Mike Gotch (email bounced)
Mike Ratcliffe
Miranda Peverett
Miranda Rogers
Mohammed Haque
Mohammed Yaqoob
Molly Sohani Hayhurst
Mr Warren
Mrs Harris
Nadia Robinson
Nathan Phillips
Neil Monaghan
Neil Whitton (2 emails)
Nichola Griffiths
Nicholas Hardyman
Nicholas Lawrence
Nick Jackson
Nick Mills
Nick Vernede
Nicky Warren
Nicolas Walker
Nuala Young
Olivia Robinson
OUSU President
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Oxford University Welfare Officer
P A Lawrence
P Buley
Pastor Modupe Adefala
Pat Hartigan
Patricia Baker-Cassidy
Patricia Dorothy Wright
Patricia Mary Mansfield
Patrick Coulter
Patrick Mukholi
Patrick Walter
Paul Bailey
Paul Cullen (email bounced)
Paul Gourd
Paul Isaacs
Paul Kiernan
Paul Kincavel
Paul Landon
Paul Maison
Paul Medley (email bounced)
Paul R Turner
Paul Southouse
Paul Spencer
Paul Townsend
Paul Wilson
Paula Lopez
Pauline Low
Penny Jaques
Peter Bentley
Peter Collins
Peter Fuller Thompson
Peter Humphrey
Peter James
Peter James Wilkinson
Peter Jarvis
Peter John Winchester
Peter Sage
Peter Schofield
Peter Thayer
Peter Thompson
Peter West
Philip Allen
Philip Brown
Philip Goodliffe
Philip Kirk
Phyllis M. Chesworth
Pilar Thompson
Qing Yu-Carver
R Navarrete
Rachael Elizabeth
Farnsworth
Rachel Best
Rachel Brown
Rachel Mary Claire Smith
Phiri
Rachel Menzel
Rachel Williams
Rafel Bordas
Raph Moroney
Rebecca A Miles
Rebecca Holt
Rebecca Micklem
Rhonda Riachi
Richard Bradley
Richard Bryant
Richard Gordon
Richard Ian Grant
Richard J Ousworth OP
Richard Kuziara
Richard Mann
Richard Murray
Richard Sharp
Richard Thurston
Richard Whittington
Rita E. Pattullo
Ro Turan
Robert John Goddard
Robert Johnson
Robert Marsh
Robert Price
Robin Henry Palmer
Robin Moxon
Robyn Blackburn
Rodney Tulloch
Roger File
Romina Peddis
Ronald Henry Cosford
Ronald Mansfield
Ronald Heritage
Rosamund Weatherall
(email bounced)
Rose Freeman
Rosemary Cox
Rosemary Fennell
Rosemary Napper
Rosemary Pocock
Rosemary Ruth Belton
Rosemary Williams
Rosemary Williams
Roy Darke
Roz Smith
Ruaridh Duncan
Ruth Catherine Derbyshire
Ruth Davis
Ruth Finar
Ruth Gass
Ruth Kinahan
Ruth Mayne
Ruth Wilkinson
Sadie Paige
Sally Ann Lessiter
Sally Hemsworth
Sally Latham
Sally Prime
Sally Tyndel
Sam Clarke
Samantha Demant
Sara Fernandez
Sarah Babb
Sarah Casey
Sarah Clark
Sarah Lasenby
Sarah Leach
Sarah Lumsdon
Sarah Mays
Sarah Steere
Sarah Wild
Scott Knight
Scott Mandelbrote
Sean Silk
Shane Clark
Sietske Boeles
Simon beattie
Simon Norris
Simon Payne
Simon Romain
Siobhan H Stead-Ellis
Sophia Pain
St John Edward James
Mitchard
Stacey Bowden
Stan Hunter
Stanley Cook
Stavroula Kounadea
Stella Welford
Stephen Bowley
Stephen Brown
Stephen C Young
Stephen David Baker
Stephen Gower
Stephen Hemming
Stephen Pickles
Steve Bligdon
Steve Cooper
Steve Gerrish
Steve Hodgson
Steve Hunter
Steve Lees
Steve Mortimer
Steve Turner
Stuart Jenkins
Stuart McCready
Stuart Meanwell
Stuart Skye
Sue Barker
Sue Crook
Sue Newman
Sue Panton
Suresh Kumar Lal
Susan Christiansen
Susan Lake
Susan Mallett
Susan White
Susanna Pressel
Susannah Harris-Wilson
Susanne Marburg
Susie Preston
Suzanne Aspden
Swetha Sundaram
Sydney Denton
Sylvain Phaneuf
T Wells
Tamasin Lilwall
Tania Brown
Tara Stewart
Terence Ernest Wood
Terence James Roper MBE
TD
Terry Willemite
Tessa Clayton
Theresa Evans
Thomas Woodruffe-Peacock
Thomas Wright
Tim Davies
Tim Dossor
Tim Green
Tim Holtham
Tim Hope
Timothy James pocock
Tina Mawson
Tina Pratt
Tom Ashley
Tom Knollys
Tom Mather
Tony Brett
Tony Hollander
Tony Joyce
Tonyeh Vincent
Tracey Rogers
Troth Wells
Valerie Churchill
Valerie Petts
Van Coulter
Vanessa Lea
Vanessa Matthews
Vanessa Pickles
Vernon Porter
Vicky Aston
Victor Regoczy
Victoria Trotman
Vincent Gillespie
Vincenzo Rampulla
Virginia Ross
Vyyvan Salmon
Wendy Skinner Smith (2 emails)
William Henry Jonathan
Bainton
William Powlett Smith
William Tumbridge
Zara Woolley
## Appendix B: Comments left as feedback on events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Oxford</td>
<td>Appreciated the fact that they were being consulted at this stage&lt;br&gt;Thanked the officers for taking the time to inform them&lt;br&gt;Did not see the point in commenting over something that perhaps was not going to happen, paper exercise that would just get filed and forgotten, would prefer to comment on specific proposals rather than not knowing&lt;br&gt;Confusion over what the event was for&lt;br&gt;Understanding of what the colours meant (specifically yellow), confused between the brown shown on the map and the brown shown on the key&lt;br&gt;Found it difficult to orientate ourselves (request to put a dot on the plan showing where we were)&lt;br&gt;Wondered whether comments could be made online&lt;br&gt;Put pdfs of comments up instead (raw material seen by public)&lt;br&gt;Consultation: engage and take notice&lt;br&gt;If can’t accommodate people’s opinions then tell them why&lt;br&gt;Thoughts aren’t acknowledged&lt;br&gt;People’s attitudes based on experience of recent Core Strategy Consultation which was a disaster. Have a long way to go to regain trust&lt;br&gt;Officer responded that they did publicise but they weren’t explicit&lt;br&gt;Planning do whatever they want&lt;br&gt;Everyone saying to go to these events&lt;br&gt;Not enough planners&lt;br&gt;A biscuit was very welcome! An offer of coffee or tea still more so, though I didn’t accept. Confusing. Did a red dot mean you were for or against the view? What were the tiles for? Such problems explain why I preferred to use a post-it note and this form. I am rather deaf so didn’t want to ask questions.&lt;br&gt;But will views be heard?&lt;br&gt;Very polite staff&lt;br&gt;Larger scale maps would help. Please keep us (i.e. the city residents) better informed.&lt;br&gt;Questions on housing are contradictory and over complicated&lt;br&gt;Glad to see that there are few areas being considered near our home!&lt;br&gt;Council officers friendly and positive. Maps too small.&lt;br&gt;Thank you very much for arranging the meetings&lt;br&gt;Nice presentation&lt;br&gt;There seemed to de details still unavailable as to landowners ideas for development&lt;br&gt;It is very informative. The staff were very helpful and welcoming. Thanks to all.&lt;br&gt;Needed to be advertised better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summertown</td>
<td>Thank the City Council and staff for tonight. Found it very interesting and useful and will be checking the website&lt;br&gt;Too cramped and not enough room. Too many people around the Summertown table. No tables to write comments.&lt;br&gt;Should have had staff from the housing department and environmental health&lt;br&gt;Very interesting evening with a lot to think about&lt;br&gt;Members of staff very helpful. I found the map hard to understand but very grateful of their help&lt;br&gt;Is there going to be one in the Town Hall with other departments involved?&lt;br&gt;The Councillor did not have a name badge on&lt;br&gt;Very interesting and please that I came&lt;br&gt;Room too small and very crowded. Summertown table too busy. Was given a comment for to fill in.&lt;br&gt;Found evening very enjoyable and interesting&lt;br&gt;Website hard to follow and maps difficult to use&lt;br&gt;Very grateful to have the chance to make comments and to ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbird Leys</td>
<td>Thank you for the chance to ask questions. I have found it very interesting and useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>Very interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleased with the intent to consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nice to be consulted. Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrect address (you said it was in St Ebbes) meant that I had difficulty finding the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue fine for me as I know where it is!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pressure on housing is made worse by Brookes continuing to expand student numbers every year. No information about this and no acknowledgement of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headington</td>
<td>Very well presented in this format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better than I expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sadly, but inevitably, key issues were excluded (Barton West, Grenoble Road).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I attended the consultation in Headington and found the staff very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We could have had a presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A presentation would have been more illuminating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What use were the 'monopoly' pieces? Initial introductory talk would have been useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too many people and need another meeting for us to study the maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>The information provided on the suggested sites is too vague so it is impossible to make any kind of detailed comment-the value of this consultation is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome early consultation but process should be reviewed and improved. Residents who attended the meeting learnt nothing more than was available on the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The community must be involved in plans. At the next stage must consult down to the level of neighbours who would normally be consulted at the planning application stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor spelling at the exhibition People who come to exhibitions tend to be older and do care very much about these things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Summary of comments on sites made at the events or received via email, letter or online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>005 Allotments at East Minchery Farm</td>
<td>No development - allotments needed.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bring back into community/allotment use. ‘Disused’ sites not on allotment map on Council’s website, so people don’t have a chance to ask for plots on them.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 Arthur Street (Old Power Station)</td>
<td>Retain this historic building!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities for residential boaters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make into an art space/gallery.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010 Avis site</td>
<td>Boatyard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities for residential boaters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential as in existing policy should be implemented</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013 Banbury Road (55-111) and Bevington Road (124-126)</td>
<td>Already developed to capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016 Bertie Place Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Must retain some play area as Hinksey Park is too far for young children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019 Binsey Lane disused allotments</td>
<td>Needed as allotments. Should be publicised.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leave as it is or sports use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suitable for outdoor sport and recreation compatible with green belt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cemetery would be good here especially a green cemetery.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could tidy up the road a bit.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021 Blackbird Leys Road</td>
<td>Good location for shops/improve shops</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The library is important. It gives people access to the internet, e.g. to bid for houses.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a feasibility study been done for the regeneration area in Blackbird Leys and will we be consulted?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If we are getting a new swimming pool why can’t we have a new library in the same building?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for pool in Blackbird Leys. Note it’s on the bus route of people from Temple Cowley.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022 BMW Garage Comment received although no being consulted upon as had been filtered out</td>
<td>What about the BMW garage across the road?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024 Bradmore Road (includes DS9)</td>
<td>The character of Banbury Road housing is very special and any infill in back gardens could damage the area. At capacity.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028 BT Site</td>
<td>Suggest open Space.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within the surface and groundwater catchment of springs that feed Lye Valley SSSI. Any removal of existing hard surface would benefit springs that feed the SSSI south Fen. Increase in permeable hard surfacing is of concern.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031 Canalside Land</td>
<td>Boatyard/facilities for residential boaters.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to see community site comprising bridge over canal, piazza, facilities for boat owners and other facilities desired by local people e.g. shops, workshops, performance space, public loos, seating. All in keeping with the local area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range of development options possible including residential, community and boatyard uses.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need a suitable/better scheme more sympathetic to Jericho. May be affected by new conservation area.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034 Churchill Hospital Site</td>
<td>Animal research.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No further development until access resolved reducing traffic.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040 Court Place</td>
<td>Boatyard/facilities for residential boaters.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used to be a right of way through grounds for Rose Hill residents but closed off. Should be re-established (though vehicle through route would become a rat run). Increased traffic could create problems- would need to improve junction of Oxford Road with bottom of Ashurst Way. Eco homes through self build scheme.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042 Cowley Community Centre</td>
<td>Retain for community use.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043 Cowley Marsh Depot</td>
<td>Keep as Council owned - indoor skate park?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep/return to park. Large housing developments place demand on existing space.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When/if Temple Cowley pool has to close at the end of its life in about 30 years time, this could be used for new pool and ice rink.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046 Crippley Road</td>
<td>No objection to use but depends on the detailed design.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full of wildlife including badger sets. Allotments would need to improve fancing or at risk from badgers.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow and next to railway with little access.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would overlook allotments, Also already problems with emergency access route through car park often being blacked by parked vehicles.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049 Diamond Place and 058 Ewert House</td>
<td>Comments in support of the car park/not wishing to see development on the car park. Various reasons given: Car park needed to support local traders Bus/foot/bike not always suitable</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After money has been spent on improving the area it would be a shame to waste this. The car park is often full/nearly full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The car park is needed for access to schools, the community centre and sports centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The village feel of Summertown should be kept, with no excessive development Short-term secure, attractive parking is part of the attraction of Summertown A car park is also an open space where we can see the sky Why have more shops when there is an excellent range already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about possible loss of parking spaces. Clarification needed.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about possibility of undercroft/multi-storey/below ground provision because they may lead to antisocial behaviour, be unpleasant to use and dangerous for children and may result in a loss of spaces.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need free parking/more spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would Ewert house not be suitable- if it were converted into flats- to house students? They would have access to shops and buses and contribute financially to local businesses. At the same time, the car park would remain.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The site is suitable for housing/university use. Some conditions: Ewert House low density, poor quality. But go down say 2 levels for multi-storey parking. Go high in replacing Ewert House-7 or 8 floors? Not destroying views of Oxford. Go for innovative design. Require developer to keep some public parking all the time- secure and attractive. Retain right of way across site. Pupils from Cherwell School use that route in large numbers so the proximity of the school is very important when considering the future use of the car park.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not more houses/offices: Student housing accommodation more suitable than housing as less traffic. Stop cramming more housing into Oxford and ruining it. Housing and offices outside Oxford makes travel easier.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If developed must include as much parking. Easily accessible. Extra temporary parking needed during development to protect shops.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that there should be some affordable accommodation in Summertown if necessary by less parking spaces. After all there is an excellent bus service through from Park and Ride. The short term parking is vital however for the shops - 30 mins etc. Secure, attractive short term parking. Some housing development.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nightclub.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The parking provision is essential for shops and restaurants. Undercroft car parking would be very antisocial and unsatisfactory and would lose</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>051 Dorset House and 052 Dorset House, 42 and 44 London Rd &amp; 1A Latimer Rd</strong></td>
<td>Student accommodation should be mixed with housing/key worker housing for NHS staff.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suitable for student accommodation. Some conditions: provide better bus service, do not allow student parking, develop like Slade Park.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problems from students here likely: increased pressure on local community, litter, unruly behaviour. Students have different consumer needs - clubs etc. Also increase in parking pressure.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should retain the 2 attractive houses. Development should have a similar character to what has been demolished and not be hideous cheaply built halls of residence.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition on site should not have been allowed - characterful buildings have been lost.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why not a mix of private and social housing - student proposals do not address the problems of Headington and the London Road (ie domination by students, lack of social housing, good architecture).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to see a new library built to replace the one in Headington and easier for people with disabilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>054 East Oxford Bowls Club site</strong></td>
<td>Totally unsuitable. Too small and will change rural setting of Bartlemas area too much.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should be for recreational use (sports or extend allotments) or small scale housing with large gardens to the front and rear in keeping with Conservation Area.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shortage green spaces in East Oxford so should not develop/must be replacement facilities that are better in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>056 Elsfield Hall</strong></td>
<td>Development here seems ok. Could go residential if people will tolerate the traffic noise.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should not be redeveloped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>059 Faculty of Music</strong></td>
<td>Need to keep as it is not redevelopable.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In existing residential use and located within the core of educational and institutional facilities at the centre of Oxford (which are under continued pressure for space) so should be kept for educational use.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>061 Former Bartlemas Nursery</strong></td>
<td>Unsuitable for development: too small; negative effect on Bartlemas conservation area; will destroy unique character of Bartlemas Chapel, farmhouse and leper hospital-heritage should be preserved.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any development should be sensitive, small-scale in keeping with Conservation Area (possibly including by retaining D2 use).</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oriel has reapplied to build a post-graduate dormitory on the site of Bartlemas nursery. This dormitory should be built on site 54, the former East Oxford Bowls Club. The Bartlemas Leper Chapel is unique in that the Chapel, former hospital and the farmhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfect place to develop.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>062 Former Barton Road Cricket Ground</strong></td>
<td>Keep as public open space (especially if Barton is developed). Allotments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covenant preventing &quot;unsuitable development&quot;.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If development goes ahead, replacement facilities that are equivalent or better in terms of quality, quantity or accessibility must be provided elsewhere.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In support of development: Seems sensible to build housing here but should be sensitive to nearby Conservation Area. It is lovely open space but there are other open spaces nearby for people to use.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065 Former Government Buildings</td>
<td>Develop for student accommodation. OCIS (owners of the site) propose the site for accommodation for its staff and students, which is appropriate in context of surrounding area. If it is to be developed it should be for affordable housing rather than more student accommodation. Young people from Marston cannot afford to live in the area. Should take into account recent developments in Marston that have greatly increased the ‘studentification’ of the area.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067 Fox and Hounds pub &amp; former petrol station</td>
<td>Hotel Good for affordable housing, but not for Tesco The site is within the Abingdon Road and New Hinksey Neighbourhood Centre and as such PPS4 encourages retail on the site. This would promote sustainable shopping patterns and create jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069 Garages and Land East of Warren Crescent</td>
<td>Will block access to Town Furze allotments. 4 metre access + right angle turning is essential for deliveries of compost/manure etc. The site lies in the centre of the surface and groundwater catchments of springs that emerge in the LNR/WS/SSSI. As it is currently mown amenity grass it is very permeable. Any interruption of percolation into the fens will degrade the habitat and range of wetland species that live there. Drying out of the SSSI (home of many rare species of plants and invertebrates) is partially due to erosion from flash floods from road surface water. SUDs can’t be relied on to guarantee to deliver all rainwater from buildings, paved areas and access roads in perpetuity. The loss of recreation is also an issue.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072 Gipsy Lane campus</td>
<td>No further development until access resolved reducing traffic. Student accommodation. This would be more affordable than private housing and increase the availability of private housing and landlords would make houses available for families. I am concerned about development of Gipsy Lane campus most especially as it may offer to host the Headington library as a trade off. Headington library is a cultural asset to the community especially in its current facility.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074 Harcourt House</td>
<td>Student use possible Family housing and/or student accommodation. Further large-scale student accommodation would not be desirable- recent developments in New Marston have increased the ‘studentification’ of this locality significantly. Hotel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075 Headington Car Park</td>
<td>Site needed for cars. I would accept that shops could be build above if alternative car parking could be provided during construction. short term, secure, attracive car parking is an integral part of the attraction of the area and needs to be preserved/enhanced in development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposed to development of the car park. Waitrose is very popular and it needs a car park. Car park is vital to health of Headington shops and businesses including Waitrose and for access to doctors, solicitors etc. Housing would increase traffic and parking in the neighbouring residential area and in unauthorised places. It’s not appropriate to build like this in a conservation area. Area already poor shops and bad image, possibly because parking is difficult as it is and because ‘improvements’ destroyed the character. Car park is necessary at times - shops sell goods you can’t take on a bus; it helps disabled people access the shops and library etc; buses don’t work for everyone for every event; buses can be difficult for people with buggies. Any development is likely to overlook the park, which wouldn’t be acceptable. No support for decking on the car park to achieve a mixed-use development- promises of car park below development is not pleasant for many users. Can attract people looking for shelter, eg drunks, The car park is well used and often full.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078 Headington School</td>
<td>Sports facilities should be made available for public use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080 Herbert Close</td>
<td>These grass tennis courts are outdoor sports facilities adjacent to an existing playing field that should be protected from development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082 Horspath Site</td>
<td>Allotments needed, especially in Headington/Cowley area. Would generate income from rent and increase health and wellbeing on its users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop for (exclusively) outdoor sports use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop for cricket pitches- especially if Rover pitches are lost- demand in the area is high.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should remain as sports ground/athletics as well used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084 Iffley Road Sports Centre</td>
<td>Concern that people are paying tax for University to develop on their land and not get the benefit of their facilities. Future facilities should be made available to the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086 Institute of Health Sciences</td>
<td>Student accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090 John Radcliffe Hospital Site</td>
<td>No further development until access resolved reducing traffic. Better access for buses and cyclists. New access roads from A40 will bring more rat running through Old Headington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider green areas providing green access towards city (footpath route). Cuckoo Lane cut off from JR. Should be opened up to allow access to mature trees on the JR side and the JR green beyond. Could link Headington Hill conservation area with Old Headington Conservation area. Tastefully improve Cuckoo Lane to allow safe bike/pedestrian access from Headington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority for family/key worker accommodation (no increase in commuting).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly impinges on conservation area of Headington - need to avoid increase in traffic on these very narrow roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092 Kassam Stadium and surrounding area</td>
<td>Preserve green spaces in socially disadvantaged areas!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is waste land and would like it as a nature park or back to former use as allotments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car parking is an issue especially when big events are on. Car Park well used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could do something on the area to the rear of Kassam. If it were housing access would be a problem. Mixed housing/recreation but no access to be provided for vehicles to Knights Road. Make it clear main use to be protected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093 Keble Road Triangle and Science Area (inc DS9)</td>
<td>University should redevelop science area putting more communal space between buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned that Oxford University will demolish buildings and build glass boxes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally happy with development here. The University usually develop their land quite sensitively so we should just let them get on with it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094 King Edward St (1-17) and High St (107-110)</td>
<td>Seems fine to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Land off Marston Ferry Road (north)</td>
<td>Watch out for gypsies. We do not want them to encroach on any more land around Oxford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep as a meadow/agricultural use. A green lung - not suitable for development Sites are flood plain and protect North East Oxford from flooding. Anything that interferes with that function threatens the nearby housing with flooding. That includes Green Belt developments such as cemeteries and tennis courts. Even porous paving interferes with the sponge effects of the meadow. Any development threatens the character of the Green Belt/function as wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Details</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marston Sports Centre (south)</td>
<td>Not a good place for sporting facilities. There are already a lot of sports fields in the vicinity. Even sports use would impact on river valley-it would need flood lights and parking. Not suitable for development for hard surface sporting facilities. Generally happy with development here. Should only be used for Green Belt compatible uses/recreation compatible with green belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 Land off Marston Ferry Road (south)</td>
<td>Keep as a meadow/agricultural use, maintaining the function of a wildlife corridor. A green lung - not suitable for development. Sites are flood plain and protect North East Oxford from flooding. Anything that interferes with that function threatens the nearby housing with flooding. That includes Green Belt developments such as cemeteries and tennis courts. Even porous paving interferes with the sponge effects of the meadow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Land rear of Reliance Way</td>
<td>Maintain as important wildlife corridor. Brown Hairstreak Butterfly colony on site- high priority protected BAP species. Valuable open green space for local residents. Barracks Lane is an empty area and crime spot, if this site got developed (with a sensible number of houses and flats, maybe lower than surrounding) it would improve the area and would make cycling more pleasant (improvement on cycle lane needed- overlooking would help). 2 other members of the public spoken to at event felt positive about the possibility of this site being developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Leiden Road (Marywood House)</td>
<td>This site could be suitable for an army cadet centre, to replace the one lost at The Slade (developed for Brookes). Within the catchment for Lye Valley SSSI. Increase in impermeable hard surfacing could affect surface water catchment zone of Lye Valley fen and thus affect hydrology of the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Lincoln College Sports Ground</td>
<td>Not suitable for development. Would affect rural setting of the Bartlemas conservation area and listed houses. Development could be detrimental to conservation area. Must retain open country feel of setting. Enhance safety of cycle path (good if its overlooked rather than secluded). If develop replacement facilities, equivalent or better in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility, will need to be provided. Shortage of green space in East Oxford so oppose development of green field sites in the area. While one is surprised, even disappointed, that Lincoln College want to sell it, it could surely host a very pleasant area of housing, provided that all the traffic for it enters and leaves from Bartlemas Close, with the trees along Barracks Lane left.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Littlemore Mental Health Centre - field</td>
<td>Open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Longlands</td>
<td>Concerned about loss- understand change in oxfordshire’s care model. Site should be used for community facilities for the elderly. Long term care homes to replace Longlands and Windale House is excellent idea. Support more independent living for the elderly. Siting of entrances/car parks must be given careful consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Manor Ground</td>
<td>Area should be developed. The social housing here has not been built. Keen for it to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 Marston Court</td>
<td>This site should be kept as it is. Marston Court is an elderly person’s home run by a charity, The Order of St John. It is home to many vulnerable, elderly people and also serves as a respite care facility and day centre for local elderly people. It is near transport links and healthcare facilities eg JR. It is part of the community and helps to create a balanced community. Many residents are from the local community so this site should be kept as it is for them. Moving residents would cause them considerable stress. Understand Oxfordshire are changing their care model. Site should be used for community facilities for the older population. Suitable for (family) housing. Mix of private and social housing. Suitable interim rented or shared ownership Marston Court site not suitable for student housing - in a residential area. If it is to be redeveloped for family housing possibly interim rented housing association or shared ownership homes. Student accommodation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Northfield School site</td>
<td>Was told at a meeting it would never move. Could improve access to Grenoble Road. Although playing fields are private there should be an assessment of whether there is an excess of playing field land in the area. Mixed housing/recreation but no access to be provided for vehicles to Knights Road.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 Northway Centre</td>
<td>Need for affordable housing.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre</td>
<td>Animal research.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 Osney Mead</td>
<td>Boatyard/facilities for residential boaters.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 Oxford Business Park</td>
<td>Should be allocated to housing in those areas where business development has not taken place.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 Oxford Retail Park</td>
<td>Are we getting a three storey Tesco to replace the existing one and what is happening to the parking land at the rear?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Oxford Stadium</td>
<td>Suitable for development for housing/mixed use housing and leisure Sport and leisure Additional uses appropriate but should make clear sports pitch and ancillary facilities are protected. Why is it being run down? If developed there shouldn’t be access onto Sandy Lane. Consideration must be made for parking off Sandy lane as area should be serviced by access from Watlington Road not Sandy Lane.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 Park Hospital Site</td>
<td>Should look to house more staff locally especially student trainees. Protect existing football pitch The building is not listed so if earmarked for development the former Highfield House will be lost.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Paul Kent Hall</td>
<td>Within the catchment for Lye Valley SSSI. An increase in impermeable hard surfacing could affect the surface water catchment zone of the Lye Valley Fen. There could also be an increase in run-off, contributing to flash-flooding which causes erosion and further drying out. An increase in permeable soil area would be beneficial.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 Railway Lane</td>
<td>Why has there been nothing built on this site? Would like to see mixed social housing and recreation area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 River Hotel and 3-15 Botley Road</td>
<td>Boatyard/facilities for residential boaters. Suitable for residential or hotel or a combination as it is close to the City Centre and there is a recognised need for more mid-range and budget hotel accommodation.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Rover Sports Club field</td>
<td>Not owned by them. Retain for public sports. PPG17 is clear that public and private playing fields should be protected. Therefore, the site is not suitable for employment.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 Ruskin College, Dunstan Road</td>
<td>It is important to retain green spaces in East Oxford, which is lacking in spaces and losing them. The land should be used for allotments/recreational uses.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(fields) | Possible access to JR site needs to be considered. | 1 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A footbridge over the ring road is highly desirable, although Ruskin fields should be retained as a recreational area.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any development should be minimal and should fit in with local character. Surely there are better sites?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access would be through the Northway estate- there are no details of how or where.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The college support development of a sensitive nature with open space provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site should not be developed for housing/other uses: No development in conservation area, especially as Ruskin have sold Walton Street site. This is a conservation area and therefore should not be built on. Old Headington is old and should be protected. The fields are an important green space and allow an important open aspect along this boundary. Should, say, 2 or 3 houses be built, it would be like breaching a wall in one place, which then allows other developments to go ahead. The area is already overrun with traffic and gridlocked frequently. Should be no further permission here. Ruskin already has permission for substantial building programme. Development would destroy the only remaining example of English countryside in the North East Oxford City Council area. There is abundant wildlife (eg owls, foxes), which ranges into Old Headington. Development creates drainage issues.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The fields are in the conservation area and must be preserved for the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 and 154 Ruskin College, Dunstan Road</td>
<td>Dunstan Road is already a rat-run. Traffic is a serious problem here.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No further permission should be permitted here. Ruskin already has permission for substantial building programme.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The college support sensitive development on the site.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Scrap Yard Comment received although site had been filtered out</td>
<td>The scrapyard at the bottom of Jackdaw Lane is still unsuitable for housing development. It was agreed this is in the flood plain. Apparently there are plans to reverse this previous recognition.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 South Parade 2-5</td>
<td>Suitable for shops and residential only.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex shop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stripclub</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally happy with development here.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site already developed to capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 South Parks Depot</td>
<td>Open Space.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 St Clements Car Park (part)</td>
<td>The car park should be left as it is: The car park is needed to keep this area alive and for local businesses to prosper. Its loss would destroy St Clements as an area. Retail shopping would be pushed to outskirts, eg Botley. The car park is needed to enable access to the area, especially for the disabled, those with buggies, those who need to carry a heavy shopping load and those who do not have good/any public transport connections to the area (some businesses attract clients from a wide area). Students would commute by bus and could be housed further out. The car park helps regulate on-street parking and reduce illegal parking. Free parking would have beneficial effects. With the new Sainsbury’s a car park is needed. The car park is well used and there are few on-street alternatives Building on stilts and undercroft parking does not create a pleasant environment and can lead to crime.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferably no development. If building on stilts alternative parking essential.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shouldn’t have surface car parking in our society (think of 25 years from now).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A good design is needed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>165 St Cross College Annex</strong></td>
<td>Vacant land behind Holywell cemetery - use for Merton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holywell cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No problem with developing it for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>166 St Frideswide Farm</strong></td>
<td>Christ Church submitted a document promoting the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>168 Suffolk House</strong></td>
<td>Ugly, could be redeveloped but for similar use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally happy with development here. Been in local plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As part of the redevelopment would like small retail units on ground floor and studio units above and offices and studios etc (e.g. an enterprise centre).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site already developed to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>169 Summertown House</strong></td>
<td>Why change it? It seems to work well and serve a necessary purpose. Greater housing density would seem inappropriate on this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain garages. Concerned if garages at rear would be lost as they were kept as part of original permission which assured Apsley Rd residents that there would be less parking in the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally happy with development here. Site needs doing up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site already developed to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must keep residential nature of the road and inform residents at inception stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redevelopment should not overlook or be more than 2 storeys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>171 Temple Cowley Pool</strong></td>
<td>Temple Cowley Pool (and gym) should be kept in this location. It is an important community facility in a densely populated area used by people of all ages from all backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is the only pool and fitness centre for a wide area – the accessibility and excellent bus connections help to reduce traffic. Blackbird Leys is too far for many in the area - people may not use it if travel takes too long and they can’t go when is convenient, eg before work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It should be refurbished according to the people's wishes not the Council’s/Brookes’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The car park serves also the library, health centre and pool. There is no other car park in the area. There needs to be a charge for it. It may be especially important if Cowley library becomes one of the few remaining in Oxford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surely development is limited by the conservation area. Can the stone wall be demolished?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would be better used for community facilities instead of more housing or student accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport/leisure (as per Local Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access will still be needed for Our Lady’s School to use the playing field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport England say the site should not be identified in the DPD until proposals for a replacement have been identified and supported by the local community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>176 The Rectory Centre</strong></td>
<td>Where will the services go to support those with mental health issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use as a community resource. More space needed in East Oxford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing for residents of East Oxford not student housing. Must be enough parking provided. Parking impossible in term times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>177 Townsend House</strong></td>
<td>Leave alone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is understood that Oxfordshire County Council propose to deliver a more home based care model to cater for the needs of the elderly infirm population. Therefore, the land should be made available for community facilities for the elderly population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>178 Travis Perkins</strong></td>
<td>If developed this will mean we need the Union Street car park as an open space without any buildings (except possibly a rebuilt sports hall).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No more student accommodation - keep local businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>179 Union Street Car Park</strong></td>
<td>Concerns about overlooking (incl of the school) and creating a very built up feel as the site is already surrounded by buildings. Development above 2 storeys would result in crowding spoiling the look of the children’s centre. Open space. Need an alternative to the disappointing Manzil Way open space. No zero emissions development here. The Councillors have conflict of interest in my opinion. The site should remain as a car park. Police concern over security needs to be taken account of. Closure would be detrimental to Cowley Road. It is essential for businesses and residents. Its loss would result in more takeaways and no food shopping. There are times when people need to use their car, eg if they have buggies or a heavy shopping load and if there are not good public transport connections. Car parks reduce illegal parking. More parking is needed in East Oxford, not less (possibly free to prevent clogging up roads). This car park is in constant use. There are no alternative car parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>182 Warneford Hospital site and 183 Warneford Hospital - main site</strong></td>
<td>Development on car parks must not reduce the number of parking spaces (even in the short term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>184 Warneford Hospital site- playing fields</strong></td>
<td>I do not think the Warneford site is suitable for development or that the old buildings should be taken on by Brookes. The environment is very suitable for patient recovery and as a green corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>185 Warneford Meadows- Comment received although site had been filtered out</strong></td>
<td>Warneford land should be kept as a greenfield site/sports use. There is a lack of sports grounds/green spaces in Headington and East Oxford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>186 Wellington Square (west)</strong></td>
<td>Local people didn’t know Warneford Meadow was there until a local pressure group mentioned it and then everyone claimed they went there everyday. Should be left as it is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>190 Windale House</strong></td>
<td>Why is this site defined as shown to only include some buildings and not others? Is this defined by what the landowner is proposing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>193 Wolvercote Paper Mill</strong></td>
<td>Should also knock down Andromeda House. Long term care homes to replace Longlands and Windale House is excellent idea but siting of entrances/car parks must be given careful consideration. Should access off Field Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>000 New suggestion Florence Park</strong></td>
<td>Replacement boatyard facility/facilities for residential boaters. Would like to see social housing, eco housing, nature park, lakes etc. Should be mixed use e.g. office and light industry, eco housing, local facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>000 New suggestion Land rear Larkrise Primary School</strong></td>
<td>Between Isis Care Home and Boundary Brook Road could be used for a multi agency self build town development for unemployed or young people trained over 4 years including town planning, architect and trades all being trained in them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>000 New suggestion Redbridge recycling centre</strong></td>
<td>Yes to build housing by young unemployed people for self build housing that will train them for a trade. Maybe work with County Council Education/Youth service DWP training and other services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>000 New suggestion Allotments opposite Cowley Marsh</strong></td>
<td>Move the Jackdaw scrapyard to here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>000 New suggestion Land south of Risinghurst</strong></td>
<td>Community and residential use. Land going to waste.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>000 New suggestion Land near Elder Stubbs allotments</strong></td>
<td>Residential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>000 New suggestion Green burials?</strong></td>
<td>Nature park and allotments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Grenoble Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery off Grenoble Road?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial ground.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion Summertown strategic site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherwell School has 1800 pupils who cycle along a path from Lonsdale Road twice a day and walk through the car park to the shops at lunch and after school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion Summertown Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library - don't close.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion Land East of canal at Wolvercote Viaduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement boatyard facility (currently NE19).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion Land West of canal at Wolvercote Viaduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement boatyard facility (currently NE.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent canal at former A34/A40/canal viaduct works, offside canal. Large open space away from residential areas. Excellent road access direct onto national arterial roads. Only practical option for a canalside offside replacement facilities for Jericho Boatyard within city boundaries. Currently designated as a wildlife corridor but is in a state of wasteland. Paved with concrete for viaduct replacement, groundwork unfinished. Opposite LA21 moorings, close to Duke's Cut moorings, river access and turning point. Underground water-pollution capture (extensively redeveloped since Jericho Boatyard closure in 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion Oxpens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area near skating rink OCVC could be developed for student accommodation for Oxford University students or residential accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion site Frideswide Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Green Belt being pushed at Pear Tree this site seems logical for housing, as discrete intrusion into Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion Grantham House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantham House, Cranham Street - housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion House in Old High Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tumbledown House next to Headington car park should be developed but not the car park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion Worcester St Car Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should be considered essential for facilities for residential boaters. May be considered in West End AAP but worthy of a mention. Formerly canal wharf when the canal continued further into oxford, filled-in 1938 but never built on. Owned by Nuffield College rented to oxford City Council. Currently identified in Oxford's Local Plan for a mixed use development that may include canal basin/visor moorings. Recently suggested for an Oxford Ferris Wheel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>000 New suggestion allotments Abingdon Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there any chance of bringing the allotments near the 4 pillars hotel on Abingdon Road back into use ? It seems such a waste of space when there is a waiting list for allotments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do not know enough about necessary infrastructural needs to comment on particular areas- how about water and sewers, roads, schools, public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On sites near the greenbelt it is important to ensure important views out of as well as into the city are not adversely affected. No building on greenbelt land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Physical and social infrastructure must be provided and regeneration of existing areas adequately resourced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk of overdevelopment without enough infrastructure and damaging green spaces and biodiversity: |
| - Access to open spaces essential. Playing fields and allotments should be maintained and additional sites developed in East Oxford where there is a shortage. Green spaces in East oxford, especially around Bartleemas, should |
not be developed. Sport England object to the development of playing fields unless development meets with one of 5 exceptions tests and until the Playing Pitch Strategy is completed.

- Infrastructure, especially roads, already at breaking point and can’t cope with any more development. Comment this is especially the case in East Oxford where recent substantial developments of an institutional nature have generated thousands of additional traffic movements. Another comment that NE absorbing a high proportion of new building proposed in Core Strategy and local infrastructure, especially the Eastern bypass, cannot cope. Another comment that no site in Headington can be developed unless traffic and access is resolved.

- Oxford over-developed and soon it will be choked. We need breathing spaces.

- Many sites are community buildings/areas. You can’t have a community if there are no places in the community for people to meet and do things together.

- Biodiversity must be considered, especially on those sites adjacent or close to European or nationally designation sites. This includes sites 16, 34, 40, 46, 67, 69, 93, 104, 115, 116, 130, 165 and 193.

- There is sufficient water supply to serve developments proposed but network infrastructure upgrades may be required. (119) In terms of the wastewater network, more upgrades may be needed in the north than south. Local upgrades can take 18mths to 3 years. Policy should ensure applicants liaise with Thames Water to ensure appropriate upgrades are in place ahead of the occupation of the development.

- Need more infrastructure for growing population of residential boaters, especially need a dock and more mooring spaces.

Site size:

- Shame that site size threshold set quite high. Proposals on smaller sites would be less controversial, more likely to succeed and better able to assist the housing needs of the city.

Should consider Westgate hotel site even though it is below size threshold.
### Appendix D: Summary of Housing Comments by Topic

#### Summary comments on Affordable Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment forms, letters, emails</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council should keep the 50% requirement for providing affordable housing. (6 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% affordable housing would be better than 50%. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing is a major problem for Oxford. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseboats are an affordable housing solution. Council should support new residential moorings in Oxford. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing should be built on Grenoble Road and Barton. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage development of key worker housing, and support current definition. Oppose any widening of key worker definition to include staff from universities, research charities and university spin-out companies. (2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current policy appears to be a 1-size-fits-all approach. Policy should allow for different levels of affordable housing depending on overall level of social housing in the area (e.g. a maximum of 30% social housing in an area that already has 45% social housing. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirement for 50% of ordinary developments to be social housing does not apply to student accommodation, this encourages student development over other types, and further drives families out of the City. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a clear need for ‘affordable’ housing, but planning policies offer little scope for delivery; the only realistic way to provide key worker and other affordable housing is to build it directly. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing requirements are considered to be restrictive of development, particularly in the current economic climate. A relaxation of both the standards and tenure mix would increase delivery of both affordable and private housing. Employers would like to offer housing to staff in order to enable them to live close to work and amenities to encourage staff retention. Therefore suggest that the range of affordable housing is widened to include staff housing. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-it notes, oral comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More should be done to reduce empty properties in Council and Housing Association hands. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and medium sites should be reserved for all (100%) affordable housing. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People need much more affordable housing. Social housing should be a priority. (2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed housing is essential for a mixed community. (2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend proportion of dwelling sizes, such that developers are encouraged to build 1/2 bedroom units on sites of less than 10, as these are cheaper than renting a 3 bedroom house. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build hospital housing for hospital people on hospital land. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small sites are difficult to be developed so that they include affordable housing. (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council should promote residential boating as an affordable housing solution. (2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-housing offers a mix of housing tenures which promotes inter-generational involvement and needs of disabled people. *(4 comments)*

Would support greater tenure flexibility, e.g. social tenants should be expected to ‘downsize’ if their houses become smaller. Do not support social tenures for life. *(1 comment)*

**Summary comments on Student Accommodation**

*Comment forms, letters, emails*

Do not support new student accommodation in areas already experiencing high concentrations of students (e.g. East Oxford, Cowley Road). Do not support focusing Brookes student accommodation within 1.25km or 1.6 km of Brookes’ main campus. Should encourage student development away from residential neighbourhoods, and instead favour family housing on available land. More spreading out of student development (e.g. Wheatley campus, Barton urban extension). *(13 comments)*

Students should be celebrated and encouraged as a fundamental economic driver for Oxford. Students do not want to be squeezed into halls and student areas only. Plenty of students are well-behaved; bias against students should be ignored. *(1 comment)*

It is difficult but important to maintain a mix of students, young families and elderly people. *(1 comment)*

Student accommodation should be located close to university and college campuses. This lessens the need for student transport (coaches etc.), reduces traffic flows, discourages student from owning cars. Student accommodation at the universities would be more affordable than private family housing, thus making houses elsewhere available for families. *(6 comments)*

Student blocks are a good idea, but should incorporate what students need so they stay there (shop with stationary, snack food, milk, papers, pub, bank etc.) *(1 comment)*

Student accommodation is not such an important issue, they represent a population which needs accommodation for 8-9 months of the year, and support the existence of local traders. *(1 comment)*

Brookes students definitely need accommodation in halls of residence and very strict curbs on car use. Really no more expansion. *(1 comment)*

Welcome the fact that Oxford University recognises that growth has reached its maximum and has announced that its full time student numbers will level off at 18,000. Object to further expansion of [student at] Oxford Brookes University. The number of students living in HMOs will increase unless a cap is imposed. *(4 comments)*

Would encourage the City Council to ensure that basic student accommodation is available for the less well-off students. At present, new purpose-built student accommodation seems to be aimed at higher price ranges. *(1 comment)*

Support retaining the current Local Plan Policy HS.13 which states that existing or new purpose-built student accommodation should not be converted to any other use. *(1 comment)*

The accommodation needs of language students should not be met by dedicated student accommodation but by students staying with host families. *(1 comment)*

Oxford should not continue to develop large areas of land as student housing. Universities are taking up every bit of land in the City which could have been used for residential dwellings or even social housing. Student tuition fees are going up which may cause more students to study closer to home and perhaps stay living at home. *(2 comments)*
The environmental impact should be based on the differential between families and student environmental impacts, rather than just assuming that student housing near universities will be environmentally – this is not true as they displace families or complete for sites. (1 comment)

Disagree that student accommodation should be confined to main streets / particular areas. The number of potential sites are limited, and some of them will be needed for other uses. Students in University provided accommodation are not permitted to bring cars to Oxford, so would not generate traffic on minor roads. Existing Local Plan policy HS.14 already promotes good management of halls and protects the amenities of nearby residents; it is not considered that anything further is required. Location of new student residential development should be dealt on a case-by-case basis. (2 comments)

**Post-it notes, oral comments**

More students mean more cars. There is an increasing number of students who can afford cars and will prefer to live out in shared houses – building more halls will not take this group out of housing stock. Universities should be required to rigorously police the ‘no cars’ policy. (3 comments)

Concerned with the height of student accommodation buildings. (1 comment)

No problem with / objection to student accommodation in neighbourhoods. Support growth related to providing accommodation. Education is our main local industry. Good management is key. (3 comments)

There is too much of a concentration of students living in Headington / East Oxford; creating an unbalanced / destroying community. (3 comments)

Student growth should be limited / stopped [1 comment refers specifically to East Oxford]. (2 comments)

Council should encourage use of sites on main roads for student accommodation, even if these sites already have housing on them. This would free up housing and land for housing elsewhere. (1 comment)

Location of new student accommodation has to be right. Students will not choose to live in halls away from Brookes University / Cowley Road area, they would just choose to live in shared houses instead. (1 comment)

Students should be expected to live in halls (1 comment refers to during 1st and 3rd years). Students don’t stick to rules / look after their houses. Universities should make living in student accommodation a condition of their offer of a place on a course. (3 comments)

Object to philosophy of allowing more and more overseas students to raise university funds, so object to more student accommodation. Oxford has little land suitable for student accommodation, there are examples of unsuitable sites being developed, e.g. Exeter College accommodation at garden land in Iffley Road – flats for overseas students. Endless expansion for profit and growth is detrimental to Oxford’s sense of local community. (1 comment)

The expense of study will in future discourage students to own cars (affordability). Students are people – treat them as such. (1 comment)

New developments can accommodate students and non-students. (1 comment)

Fine on-site management of University halls of residence where nuisance occurs. Keep 1st and 2nd year students away from some areas. (1 comment)

Some students find Brookes’ halls of residence much more expensive than living out in rented property. (1 comment)
### Summary comments on Houses in Multiple Occupation

#### Comment forms, letters, emails

HMOs are a blight in every community – antisocial behaviour; lack of community; unbalanced communities (proliferation over family housing); concern to neighbours; problems with parking, noise, rubbish; general lack of house and garden maintenance results in run down appearance; encourages burglary due to student computer equipment. *(4 comments)*

Concern about the assumption that HMOs are always student / problem houses. Local people live in shared houses, but should not be forced to live in “HMO’s”. Young people increasingly have to share, yet three professionals in a house is classed as an HMO. Capping limits across Oxford is dangerous: where are these people going to live? A better strategy is to fine antisocial HMOs as a deterrent. *(2 comments)*

East Oxford is absolutely saturated with HMOs, suggest more is done to monitor the state or property frontages. *(1 comment)*

Agree that prohibiting HMOs in Headington is a good idea – we have enough already. *(1 comment)*

Changes to HMOs should be restricted / prohibited across Oxford [1 comment that area-based restrictions would simply push the problem elsewhere]. This should reduce the loss of family homes to HMOs and help maintain balanced communities. [Some comments state that Article 4 Direction is welcomed.] “Family homes should be kept as family homes.” Control of student housing is necessary. *(9 comments)*

If we freed up houses in Oxford currently used by students, then maybe we would not need to build so many new houses. *(1 comment)*

#### Post-it notes, oral comments

Some students do not care enough about their community as their stay is only transitory. Young people in shared houses do not usually become part of the local community.

There is an assumption that HMOs are all student houses; student houses does not mean all shared houses. Some locals go into education in later life. *(3 comments)*

HMOs are okay, students bad. There should be different rules for student and non-student HMOs. The statement “there are too many shared houses in my street” is more true of student HMOs than of shared houses of working people. HMOs are often the only accommodation locals, who are part of the professional workforce and often work hard, can afford. There is nothing wrong with shared houses of working people but students should be accommodated by the Universities. *(4 comments)*

Oxford cannot work on the basis of restricting HMOs: Oxford was built around the Universities. Diluting the student population in a particular area could significantly affect the viability of businesses, e.g. Cowley Road. It would also push new students into less suitable areas, resulting in transport and parking problems due to poorer accessibility for students (e.g. greater student car ownership). *(1 comment)*

2 storey family homes are often occupied by 3-4 sharers, but the Council is currently not empowered to do anything about this. HMO threshold of 6 sharers is too high; a lower threshold should be adopted. Smaller HMOs are reducing the sense of community and changing the character of the area. *(5 comments)*

Small terraced houses in St Clements and East Oxford are not suitable as student HMOs – some have 5 or more bins overflowing onto the pavement. *(1 comment)*

Whether houses can be smaller HMOs should be determined by the standard of the property, not the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of this type of accommodation. (1 comment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student cars are clogging streets. Car users should be penalised. (3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared houses don’t have to mean loud music and overflowing bins – deal with these issues rather than blaming all. Consider imaginative solutions to the bin/rubbish problem of HMOs. Some method of effectively encouraging good neighbourliness is essential. Strict control of landlords should ensure standards are maintained. HMO licensing / inspection might help. (4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree Oxford should remain a vibrant place to live, but not convinced this implies encouraging HMOs. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council should assess need for more housing for singles. More older singles now. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce HMOs to 20%. Fine on-site management of halls of residence where nuisance occurs. Keep 1st and 2nd year students away from some areas. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having youngsters around is great, but larger houses are needed for families. Incorporate more small flats in new developments. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-housing offers opportunities for young people to live rent-free in exchange for offering assistance to disabled and older people. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and young workers sharing houses need good quality housing – some in mixed residential areas, some purpose-built. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary comments on Residential Design**

**Comment forms, letters, emails**

Planning policy should encourage traditional local materials in construction. (1 comment)

There is a need for adequate space in new dwellings. Squeezing too much development onto brownfield sites creates problems of rooms and gardens being too small. Cramming more development and people onto each piece of land has a cumulative effect on both character and quality of life. [1 comment supported more greenfield development instead.] (3 comments)

Object to development on open space [e.g. East Oxford, Blackbird Leys, Greater Leys]. Preservation of the green environment should be a prime consideration. (3 comments)

Plan should consider more open areas to avoid congestion and for environmental considerations. (1 comment)

Need to ensure good quality is the hallmark of houses – organise to preserve space and fine architecture. Need to see small pleasant houses; some newer housing is too encroaching [e.g. Hayfield Road vs Waterside]. Building regulations should require the highest standards, environmentally and structurally. (4 comments)

Building line at front of properties should be maintained. (1 comment)

Large extensions at the rear of homes should not be permitted. (1 comment)

Object to garden grabbing / infill housing. Can spoil the look of streets and create more parking demand. (3 comments)

Should maintain the height of developments to be of similar height to existing buildings. (1 comment)

All buildings must have level access to main entrance (maximum slope = 1:20), and all doors should be wide enough for a wheelchair. If possible, a disabled WC should be on the same floor as the main entrance. (1 comment)

Do not build on flood plain. (1 comment)
All new residential developments must have adequate car parking space. Should not allow developments that are detrimental to parking, access and safety to drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. [1 comment suggested multi-parking and basement parking] (2 comments)

Should restrict private parking space for new housing to reduce traffic generation. (1 comment)

Should not allow flat roofs. (1 comment)

Quality design should include input from public health team who understand the link between well-being and good design. (1 comment)

Support increased density [e.g. in East Oxford]. [1 comment supported building new tower blocks adjacent to existing ones in Barton and Marston.] (2 comments)

Balconies are often built in close proximity to nearby houses, with implications for privacy and noise. It is silly to build balconies in such areas. (1 comment)

Every site and scheme will require a different approach and design policies must be sufficiently flexible to enable schemes to be assessed as a whole. The City Council should avoid setting precise residential design standards. (1 comment)

**Post-it notes, oral comments**

Need to consider what provision is being made for lifetime housing needs / adaptations against what is available now. There could be more consideration of lifetime homes standards. (2 comments)

Houses need adequate parking. The streets are crowded already. Not providing parking (unless in the City centre) just means that cars will park in neighbouring streets. (3 comments)

Car parking should be limited wherever practical, and cycling should be encouraged by all means possible. (1 comment)

Appropriateness of residential garden development depends wholly on the size of plot. Some gardens may be big enough to support new houses. [1 comment stated that privacy should be provided for those affected] (3 comments)

If densely built housing has to be an option, it should be spread across the City (i.e. affluent areas as well as socio-economically disadvantaged areas). (1 comment)

A densely built environment can create social problems and is not always pleasant. (1 comment)

It is unfeasible and impractical to insist on minimum residential space standards – albeit ideal. (1 comment)

If you apply to the Council for accommodation they have to give you what they feel is appropriate [in relation to size of dwelling] (1 comment)

Should encourage developers to be innovative in design, so that homes are built more quickly than one brick after the other. (1 comment)

Residential design is all subjective. Privacy and not being overlooked is an issue. (1 comment)

New houses should have much better insulation. (1 comment)

Some development is hideous and out of keeping. Don’t build tomorrow’s slums today. (2 comments)

Co-housing would be built to lifetime homes standards criteria and very high eco-spec. A co-housing scheme would reduce car numbers by sharing transport, as well as other facilities. (1 comment)

Quality of planning applications should be better policed. Too many seem to be insufficiently detailed or even erroneous. (1 comment)
Should be modern architecture in Oxford. (1 comment)
No more infill on brownfield sites. We have to build on some green land. (1 comment)
Build 5/6 storeys on top of park and ride sites. (1 comment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary comments on Sustainable Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment forms, letters, emails</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseboats are an affordable and sustainable housing solution. Would like to see Council supporting new residential moorings in Oxford. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan should consider “solar energy” for heating, lighting and other services in each house. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all new buildings of a high standard. Council must insist on (and enforce) high standards of energy conservation, energy generation, insulation, plumbing, electrical etc. that are often poor in new housing. Government guidance should be followed as a minimum and possibly should go beyond. (5 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new national code for housing standards will require ever improving levels of sustainable homes in the next few years; it is assumed local planning authorities cannot go beyond this. Guidance for local builders and consumers would be very helpful. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero carbon developments are always possible. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable homes / development should also include the provision of green infrastructure which connects up to the existing network of green spaces both within and outside of the district. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-it notes, oral comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider what other help can be provided to existing tenants to meet the pressure of increased fuel costs, e.g. free photovoltaic installation, claim feed-in tariff as income for Council (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All new build should be of the highest standard. Solar panels should be a requirement. Such are easier to provide at the building stage than add on later. (2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We cannot afford to build anything in future that is not sustainable. Why shouldn’t affordable housing be sustainable? (2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should require higher sustainability standards and be prepared to accept less Section 106 money. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is cheaper to live in / run green homes even if they cost a bit more to build. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support massive increase in low carbon housing. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind turbines and solar panels should only be considered for locations where they offer a significant contribution to energy saving. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest incentives, e.g. financial, could be offered to encourage energy neutral housing. Developers are on the whole only interested in the bottom line. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sustainable’ can be a cover for antisocial building and traffic strategies. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential boats are mostly entirely self-sufficient and much energy is generated from solar and wind sources. They also consume less energy than houses and residents are close to nature. More and better residential boat facilities are needed. (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Britain has disgustingly low standard of houses, don’t load the next generation with shoddy housing.

In a co-housing scheme, all houses would be to high eco-spec. It is the most sustainable option and should be vigorously promoted by the Council.

**Other comments**

**Comment forms, letters, emails**

The plan should concentrate more on housing as Oxford is fast developing but suffers from a crucial problem of housing. *(1 comment)*

It would be good now targets have been scrapped if Oxford could take a more reasoned view, as Oxford is already overcrowded. Don’t destroy this historic city. *(1 comment)*

Whatever is proposed, the outstanding need is infrastructure, e.g. roads not wide enough and pavements in bad repair. How about water, sewers, roads, schools, public transport etc.? Building houses in areas where infrastructure can cope is fine. [1 comment suggesting a specific policy is needed on water and sewerage infrastructure] *(5 comments)*

Building housing for 8,000 people needs schools, dustmen etc. which will lead to more demand on housing – an exponential growth. *(1 comment)*

More mention should be made of transport implications of development which should be looked at strategically not piecemeal. *(1 comment)*

Much attention is given to the centre of Oxford and the dreaming spires, yet in residential areas, anything seems to go. Lack of concern about destruction of what once were beautiful residential houses, and unkempt look of some streets? *(1 comment)*

Building on land for parking, local shops, recreational or community facilities is short-sighted; the long term effects are devastating to the community. *(1 comment)*

Building on local car parks will mean that local businesses will suffer when people are unable to park near the shops and go elsewhere. *(1 comment)*

Different social groups have different environmental impacts, e.g. families with children / workers can be highly infrastructure unfriendly if located on outskirts of town, but have low environmental impact if located near to their work and schools. If families are located in the City and need to use a car, there will be out-commuting, but parents living out of the City will need to in-commute if they work there. *(1 comment)*

Housing policy should embrace much more than just the erection of dwellings; communities need shops, post offices, libraries and social, cultural and recreational opportunities.

**Post-it notes, oral comments**

No mention of disabled people and their needs. *(3 comments)*

Should not look at housing in isolation as an issue. Also need to consider infrastructure needs, e.g. schools. Some sites have more problems than others on infrastructure issues. *(1 comment)*

Oxford as a local authority can’t cope with its portfolio of housing. They should consider releasing or transferring council housing. *(1 comment)*
## Appendix E: Results of Housing Table Workshop

### Affordable housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>East Oxford</th>
<th>Summertown</th>
<th>Blackbird Leys</th>
<th>Headington</th>
<th>City centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hear there is a small site round the corner from me where flats are being built, which would be perfect for me, but unaffordable. I don’t agree that smaller sites can’t provide affordable homes.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve been waiting on the list for a Council house for over 2 years, and we are not the only ones. It’s not good for the kids to have to live in such cramped conditions. The Council should make sure that social rented housing is given the highest priority, to meet the needs of low income families like us.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a junior nurse, I’m on a modest income that’s nowhere near enough to buy a house. I can’t even afford to rent a flat of my own, it’s just too expensive. The priority should be to build flats and houses that I could afford to buy or part-buy.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m a private homeowner and I’ve lived in my house for 12 years. I don’t agree that social housing should be built on land around here, as it will change the character of the neighbourhood. The Council should use planning gain money to support bespoke affordable housing developments on bigger developments, or its own land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>East Oxford</th>
<th>Summertown</th>
<th>Blackbird Leys</th>
<th>Headington</th>
<th>City centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m a student living in a hall of residence. The location is perfect as it’s close to my college, although it is surrounded by houses. There’s nothing wrong with students being neighbours with permanent residents as long as the halls are well-managed.</td>
<td>Agree: 15  Disagree: 3</td>
<td>Agree: 7  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>Agree: 5  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>29  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t find a room in halls of residence close enough to my college, so I share a house with friends. I prefer ‘living out’ in any case as I can choose who I live with. It should be my choice where I live.</td>
<td>Agree: 4  Disagree: 13</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>Agree: 0  Disagree: 1</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 5</td>
<td>Disagree: 0</td>
<td>6  19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s so noisy with all the students living in my street. It’s only fair that most students are expected to live in halls of residence. The best place for students is in purpose built student accommodation on busy roads, or in more lively areas with a range of activities. This way they are less likely to disturb local residents.</td>
<td>Agree: 18  Disagree: 7</td>
<td>Agree: 2  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 1</td>
<td>Agree: 12  Disagree: 1</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>34  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing is what’s needed in Oxford, rather than inflexible purpose built student accommodation. We should build houses and flats instead of student accommodation. As a longer-term Oxford resident, I’d be happy for students to live in houses rather than in purpose built accommodation.</td>
<td>Agree: 6  Disagree: 13</td>
<td>Agree: 2  Disagree: 0</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 1</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 7</td>
<td>Agree: 1  Disagree: 1</td>
<td>11  22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HMOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>East Oxford</th>
<th>Summertown</th>
<th>Blackbird Leys</th>
<th>Headington</th>
<th>City centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m a professional worker and responsible citizen in Oxford but can’t afford to buy a house in the City. I want to live close to where I work and close to where I go out with my friends. Sharing a house is my only option at the minute.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my street, there are simply too many shared houses. This gives rise to problems such as loud music and overflowing rubbish bins, and parking is often difficult.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s great that so many young people live in Oxford. It creates such a vibrant, lively place to live. There is a real sense of community here. Allowing shared houses, including for students, is important to maintain this.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’re an Oxford born and bred family. We’re concerned that shared houses command high rents, and take family houses away from the property market. This means there are fewer houses available, and affordable, for families like us.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>East Oxford</td>
<td>Summer‐town</td>
<td>Blackbird Leys</td>
<td>Heading‐ton</td>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m living in a new flat with my partner that’s just too small, and it doesn’t even have a garden. The Council should insist on minimum space standards, and all flats should have access to a garden or balcony.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s up to individuals, not the Council, to choose the size of flat or house that suits them. My studio flat is small, but I like it because it’s cheap and in a nice location.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing lots of car parking on new housing developments only leads to more traffic congestion in Oxford. Developers should prioritise cycle parking, and limit car parking in some locations.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on residential garden land should be allowed in some cases. This is because there is such great need for housing in Oxford.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many badly built extensions and infill buildings in my neighbourhood, that overlook other properties. I’d like to see planning policies improved to allow more effective controls over new buildings.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites and Housing Development Plan Document Public consultation report 48
### Sustainable homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>East Oxford</th>
<th>Summer-town</th>
<th>Blackbird Leys</th>
<th>Headington</th>
<th>City centre</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We say Oxford just needs more homes for everyone. Climate change will happen anyway whether we build more sustainable buildings or not. More affordable houses should definitely take priority over building sustainably.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that reducing and adapting to the impacts of climate change should be the number one priority. We need more houses, but certainly not at the expense of future generations’ energy needs and the climate. All new housing sites should provide some of their own energy generation.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a builder I do support the idea of sustainable buildings, but I’m not so sure that features such as wind turbines and solar panels are always needed on every large site. We can achieve a lot more by maximising energy efficiency in buildings, and ‘offsetting’ the impact by pooling money between developments.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think planning policies should insist that even changes to existing houses, such as extensions, should meet the highest standards for sustainable homes, even though it adds to cost. We all have to do our bit after all!</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>