PERSONAL DETAILS
(fill in Part A only once, no matter how many times you fill in Part B)

If you have appointed an agent, please show the agent’s details in this section. Add your details (as client) in the last box.

Title
MR & MRS
First name
INNES & SARAH
Last name
KING
Job title (where relevant)
N/A
Organisation (where relevant)
FRIENDS OF OLD HEADINGTON MEMBERS
Address line 1

Address line 2
OLD HEADINGTON
Address line 3
OXFORD
Address line 4
Postcode
OX3
Telephone number
Email address (USE CAPITALS)

*Client name and organisation (where relevant)
N/A

Signature:

Date: 21/3/2012

DATA PROTECTION
We will make your comments available to the public on paper at our Council offices, libraries or other suitable places, and will also publish them on our website.

We cannot accept anonymous comments. However, if you wish us to remove all personal details except your name and non-specific address (e.g. Oxford) before publishing your comments, please tick this box: ☑
**Part A**

**Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, I do not wish to speak</th>
<th>Yes, I wish to speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you answered Yes, please outline why you wish to speak.*

*Please note: the inspector will decide who to invite to speak at the hearings.*

**Do you wish to be notified of the following?** (tick as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The submission of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The publication of the inspector’s report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adoption of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL ADVICE**

For advice on making a comment please see the accompanying note which is also available at [www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation).

When completing the form, please:

- use a separate sheet (Part B) for each comment
- cover concisely all the information and evidence you feel supports or justifies your view, as this will normally be your only opportunity to tell us about it, and
- be as precise as possible.

We would prefer you to submit your response using our online consultation system where possible. This enables us to analyse responses more quickly, reduces the time taken to record them, and is more environmentally friendly.

**HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS**

Please submit your response online at: [www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation) or return the comments form by email or post:

Email: [planning policy@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:planning policy@oxford.gov.uk)
Post: Planning Policy, City Development
      Oxford City Council
      St Aldate’s Chambers
      109-113 St Aldate’s
      Oxford
      OX1 1DS

Responses must arrive at the council offices no later than 5pm on 23rd March 2012.

We will not accept comments arriving after this deadline.
Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:
(a) legally compliant? Yes [ ] No [ ]
(b) sound? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)
(a) justified? 5.33-5.34 [ ]
(b) effective? 5.1-5.6 [ ]
(c) consistent with national policy? [ ] (These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

Section 5: Paragraph 5.33

We consider that the proposals relating to Stoke Place are unsound because they cannot be justified for various reasons, partly aesthetic, partly practical. Stoke Place is the last remaining rural lane in the Conservation Area of Old Headington and is valued as such by many people; its value to the Conservation Area was highlighted in the Conservation Area Appraisal, produced and adopted by Oxford City Council in 2011.

Upgrading it to a standard suitable for a major cycle and pedestrian route would ruin it and, in any case, would not produce a suitable route, as the lane is quite steep and exists in Old Headington on to Drakelow Road at a dangerous junction, which would presumably be used daily by, among others, adults on their way to and from work and school children on their way to and from Cheney School.
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Paragraph 5.33

I feel strongly that an alternative and more suitable route should be used and would suggest it should be either at Foxwell Drive, possibly by way of a lane or there is for Cutteslowe or via the existing subway that already links Barton with Barton Road and Barton Lane.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

This is the end of the comment form.
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Section 5: Paragraphs 5.1 - 5.6.

The A40 is a major trunk road as well as being part of the ring road round Oxford and to try to turn the section between Bicester and Old Headington into something more urban would benefit no one.

Fortunately, it already has an excellent ‘buffer’ or shrubs & trees, both between the carriageways and on the edges, & the suggested landscaping & replanting proposed in the scheme would do nothing to improve this. A reduction in speed along the stretch of road between Bicester & Old Headington would help reduce the noise of traffic in both areas.

The ‘Boulevard’ proposed is cautious because it would not be effective and is a totally unavailable concept for this stretch of road. The A40 where least Bicester will be built will, of course, have houses on the north side, but in no case should houses be built on the edge of Old Headington Conservation Area.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

This is the end of the comment form.
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

We suggest that apart from the new connections across the A46 between the North and South Sides of the reduction in the speed limit, the road should be kept as nearly as possible the way it is now.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

This is the end of the comment form.

This comment form has been approved by the Plain Language Commission.
Dear Planning Policy Team,

I posted to you on Wednesday a completed comment form for my husband INNES KING and myself and I have realised that on the second page of Part A, I forgot to fill in the section headed 'Do you wish to be notified of the following?'

This email is to let you know that yes, please, we would like to be notified of all three. ie:

The submission of the BAAP Document

The publication of the inspector's report

The adoption of the BAAP Document

I apologise for my carelessness and hope that you will be able to make this inclusion for us.

Yours sincerely

SARAH KING (Mrs), Oxford, OX3
Dear Officer,

I write to register my strong opposition to the proposals for Stoke Place to become the Principal Cycle / Pedestrian Route for the Barton extension, because its unique character would be lost.

It exists as a last surviving byway and bridleway for pedestrians to withdraw from man made aspects and gain renewal among wild nature.

Living in the Conservation Area over several years I have seen, both St. Andrews LANE and Larkins LANE hard surfaced, green verges lost and widened, with lighting installed. Also Cuckoo LANE and Coffin WAY/LANE (Bury Knowle boundary) have been hard surfaced and even painted with signs.

This Upgrading has encroached upon the elements that mark a lane. To Upgrade Stoke Place in this way would not offer the most appropriate strategy, in my opinion, when compared with reasonable alternatives for a separate safe cycle route for the principal connection from West Barton.

Yours faithfully

Miss Kathleen Williams
Oxfordshire Green Party

Chair: Sushila Dhall

Secretary: Judy Chipchase

22 March 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

Barton Area Action Plan

I attach competed Form A. As my signature is digital please confirm this is in order, or if it is not that I can send in a handwritten signature to confirm this objection at a later date.

I attach Oxfordshire Green Party’s formal objections in Part B to the Maps, Para 6.1, BA 1, BA2, BA 3, BA4, BA6, BA9, BA 10, BA11, BA12, BA16, Section 9 and lack of policies for the Old Headington part of the AAP.

Although we refer specifically to these objections this does not mean that we do not object to the text and all the supporting documents to the DPD, including sustainability considerations and maps, where these are relevant to our objections to specific policies.

Please could you confirm you have received all these documents and they are in due order.

Yours faithfully,

Judy Chipchase
Barton
Area Action Plan
Comment Form for Proposed Submission Document

Part A

PERSONAL DETAILS
(fill in Part A only once, no matter how many times you fill in Part B)

If you have appointed an agent, please show the agent’s details in this section. Add your details (as client) in the last box.

Title
Mrs

First name
Judy

Last name
Chipchase

Job title (where relevant)
Secretary

Organisation (where relevant)
Oxfordshire Green Party

Address line 1

Address line 2
Oxford

Address line 3

Address line 4

Postcode
OX1

Telephone number

Email address (USE CAPITALS)

*Client name and organisation (where relevant)
Oxfordshire Green Party

Signature: Judy Chipchase. Date: 16 March 2012

DATA PROTECTION
We will make your comments available to the public on paper at our Council offices, libraries or other suitable places, and will also publish them on our website.

We cannot accept anonymous comments. However, if you wish us to remove all personal details except your name and non-specific address (e.g. Oxford) before publishing your comments, please tick this box: [ ]

No Personal Details-
Oxfordshire Green Party Submission please
**Part A**

**Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, I do not wish to speak</th>
<th>Yes, I wish to speak</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you answered *Yes*, please outline why you wish to speak*.

Oxfordshire Green Party is well informed about the planning issues involving the community in Oxford and has members in the areas affected by the proposals. We are unhappy about various aspects of the Area Action Plan and would want to put our views forward in more detail at the Hearing.

*Please note: the inspector will decide who to invite to speak at the hearings.*

**Do you wish to be notified of the following?**

- The submission of the *Barton* Plan Document
- The publication of the inspector’s report
- The adoption of the *Barton* Development Plan Document

**GENERAL ADVICE**

For advice on making a comment please see the accompanying note which is also available at [www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation).

When completing the form, please:

- use a separate sheet (Part B) for each comment
- cover concisely all the information and evidence you feel supports or justifies your view, as this will normally be your only opportunity to tell us about it, and
- be as precise as possible.

We would prefer you to submit your response using our online consultation system where possible. This enables us to analyse responses more quickly, reduces the time taken to record them, and is more environmentally friendly.

**HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS**

Please submit your response online at: [www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation) or return the comments form by email or post:

Email: planning policy@oxford.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy, City Development
Oxford City Council
St Aldate’s Chambers
109-113 St Aldate’s
Oxford
OX1 1DS

Responses must arrive at the council offices no later than 5pm on 23rd March 2012.

We will not accept comments arriving after this deadline.
DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT
(please use a new Part B for each point you are commenting on)

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Maps</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:

| (a) legally compliant? | Yes | No |
| (b) sound? | Yes | No |

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)

| (a) justified? | Not Justified |
| (b) effective? | Not effective |
| (c) consistent with national policy? | Not Consistent |

(These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

Unsound because does not adhere to advice in PPS 12 para 5.6 which requires specific site allocations in areas of change. There are no properly defined routes for access into Northway, or from Barton into new development. There are no specific allocations given for the Local Centre and facilities within this, the allocation of open space and other relevant proposals. We object to the content of various maps also because we object to various policies and the explanatory text behind them (as follows below) which we consider are not effective and not justified.
Changes to map that reflect our comments above and following comments on separate sheets below.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)
Part B
continued

**Q5.** What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

This is the end of the comment form.

This comment form has been approved by the Plain Language Commission.
DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

(please use a new Part B for each point you are commenting on)

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>6.1</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:

(a) legally compliant? **Yes**
(b) sound? **Yes**

No

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

Q3. Do you consider the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick one box only)

(a) justified? **Not Justified**
(b) effective? **Not effective**
(c) consistent with national policy? **Not consistent with national policy**

(These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

We are not opposed to housing development per se in the Strategic Development Area. Our objections (below) to policies BA1, BA2, BA3, BA4, BA6, BA9, BA12, BA19, which we consider unsound result in us coming to the view that the amount of housing will need to be reduced.
A reduction in both the area allocated for housing and density of housing. These comments also need to be read in conjunction with our comments and objections to the Sites and Housing DPD Submission Document policies HP9 and HP10 on the provision of garden space.
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

This is the end of the comment form.

This comment form has been approved by the Plain Language Commission.
**DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT**

(please use a new Part B for each point you are commenting on)

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

**Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>BA1</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Q2. Do you consider that the document is:**

(a) legally compliant? Yes No
(b) sound? Yes No

*If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.*

**Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not:** (tick one box only)

(a) justified? Not Justified
(b) effective? Not effective

Not consistent with National Policy

**Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why**

We consider advice in PPS 12 Para 5.4 has not been followed and the proposal lacks justification.

We object to the provision of houses on the northern frontage of the ring road. Although it may maximise the number of houses provided in the development, they will have a poor quality environment subject to noise and traffic pollution (planners should be aware of the dangerous levels of air pollution in the Wolvercote/Sunderland Avenue area). There is absolutely no sociological evidence to back up any statement that fronting development on to a major traffic road will help integrate the development into Oxford. Major roads are nearly always barriers to free movement and mingling of communities on either side of them. The existing hedge should remain as natural barrier as should the hedge in the central reservation. There are no real grounds for removing these long standing ecological features. We consider there is little community support for this option and are not convinced it is deliverable.
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

We would like to see the existing hedge and dualling retained. The hedge retained on the Barton side and the houses set back with mounding or planting. We would point to the pleasant nature of Northway where the houses are set back behind a hedge and green area.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

(please use a new Part B for each point you are commenting on)

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>BA3</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:
(a) legally compliant?  Yes  No  
(b) sound? Yes  No  NO

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)

(a) justified?  Not Justified  
(b) effective? Possibly not effective  
(c) consistent with national policy? Not consistent with national policy  
(These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

Contrary to the requirements it of Action Area Plans PPS 12 and Core Strategy CS 21 and local plan policy SR8
The uncultivated part of the allotment together with the existing allotments should remain in allotment use. Keeping together a larger area rather than breaking it up ensures less plots front the boundary areas which are subject to more disturbance and possible pollution.
It would be ridiculous to remove the unused allotment just to facilitate closer building to the ring road which we already object too. The allotments are also in the one of the most prominent parts of the site where a green area will add most to views in and out of the site. We are not any replacement is deliverable or justified without a site allocation.
We also consider in line with CS 21 and growing pressure on food resources West Barton requires additional allotment land than that that was allocated for Old Barton at a time when there was also pressure on food resources.
**Q5.** What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Retention of all existing site and increased allocation of allotment land.
Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>BA4, BA2</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:

(a) legally compliant? Yes No
(b) sound? Yes No No

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (Tick one box only)

(a) justified? Not justified
(b) effective? Not effective
(c) consistent with national policy? Not consistent with National Policy (These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

We consider this policy not sufficiently compliant with PPS 12 and there has been no detailed land allocation. We believe it makes to Core Strategy policy CS 21 difficult to achieve given the current level of open space provision in Barton. We also consider it counter to Core Strategy Policy CS 12 and the new linear park will not be deliverable as an area of enhanced biodiversity.

Public open space must be viewed in the terms of provision for the whole of Barton. We consider the public open space provision inadequate. We want the Nature Park as a valued local feature retained, especially as like the allotments it occupies a prominent part of the site where a green backdrop is so highly beneficial to views in and out of the site. There is community opposition to the loss of their existing nature park. It is also an important part of Barton’s existing open space provision which is hardly extensive.

We think that too much is to be crowded into the linear park. It cannot in our view retain its importance as a nature area with sufficient biodiversity, be a major source of flood attenuation measures, be a major walking and cycling route and provide high quality open space for residents of both Barton and the new development to be active in the area allocated to it.

As in the policies in the areas outlined in BA 19, similar precautions against damaging the brook and its ecology need to be taken in the strategic development area.
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Larger allocation of Public open space to meet both existing requirements of Barton and the new development. The safeguarding and improvement of exiting nature areas and the biodiversity of the Bayswater Brook.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>BA6</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:

(a) legally compliant? Yes [ ] No [ ]
(b) sound? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.
Q3. Do you consider the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick one box only).

(a) justified? No

Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

(b) effective? May not be deliverable
(c) consistent with national policy? No (These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

We consider this will not meet the requirements of PPS 12. There is no clearly defined or marked out route into the development from existing Barton. There is similarly no clear route into Northway. We do not consider the proposals of a route into Northway have been adequately justified as we think alternatives such as a route via Marsh Lane should be considered rather than disturbing the amenities of the residents unnecessarily. We are not sure the proposals for Northway are deliverable by other parties to them.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)
Q5. Consideration of the feasibility of bus routes and emergency vehicle connection via Marsh Lane.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Do you consider that the document is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) legally compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) sound?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) justified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

We consider this proposal is departing too far from the existing Core Strategy Policy CS 23, CS24 which is based on national policy considerations and would fail to deliver the requirements of those policies.

2. We object amount to a minimum level of social housing of 40%. This is likely to lead to the abandonment of policy CS 24 in the Oxford Core Strategy that rules that generally a minimum of 50% of the proposed dwelling will be affordable housing. This is particularly important when this site is one that is expected to make such a major contribution to Oxford’s housing needs and the inability to build 50% or even 50% plus social housing at Barton will mean that this level of social housing will be unachievable throughout Oxford as a whole. Other developments elsewhere are likely to be much smaller, unlikely to have the influence on tenure provision the Council has as landowner and offer far less opportunity for high levels of social housing.

We have reservations about the 35% allowance in some cases, we think it may prejudice an overall higher figure in the long term and not provide the balanced social communities that a higher allowance affords. And as such could prejudice Core Strategy policy CS 23.
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

We want to see 50% minimum affordable housing. See also our submission on Sites and Housing DPD submission document Policy HP 3.
**Q1.** Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>B10, B11</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


**Q2.** Do you consider that the document is:

(a) legally compliant? Yes [ ] No [ ]
(b) sound? Yes [ ] No [ ]

*If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.*

**Q3.** Do you consider the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick one box only)

(a) justified? No [ ]
(b) effective? Possibly not [ ]
Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

Unsound because does not adhere to advice in PPS 12 para 5.6 which requires specific site allocations in areas of change Have doubts about deliverability in terms of partners coming forward. Concerned about how the emergence of academies will affect school proposals and what partners will come forward for any shopping and other facilities

Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

More detail regarding site allocations and partners and participants and the feasibility of them coming forward.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>BA 12</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:
Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)

(a) justified? No
(b) effective? NO
(c) consistent with national policy? NO

(These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

This policy largely repeats Policy CS 9 (Energy and Natural Resources) in the Core Strategy. As in our submission on the Sites and Housing DDP we consider that more evidence is required and consideration of alternatives. This is especially true in an AAP that requires implementation of the Zero carbon Developments aimed at in the Core Strategy. We consider there needs to be specific requirements in all aspects of optimising energy efficiency and without these the policy is not deliverable. We also consider given the time period of the development (and the possibility it could be prolonged), and the urgency to act against climate change. that 20% is far too low a requirement for on-site renewable and low-carbon energy sources.

Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Specific measurable policies for energy efficiency and a far higher figure for on-site renewables.
Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

Paragraph 8.14 Policy BA16 Proposals map Sustainability appraisal

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:

(a) legally compliant? Yes No
(b) sound? Yes No

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)

(a) justified?
(b) effective? Not effective
(c) consistent with national policy? (These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

Green roofs must be made a part of Policy BA16. Otherwise their installation cannot be regarded as a being implemented or monitored as a really important means of limiting surface water drainage.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

The installation of Green roofs to have policy status in BA 16.
Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Section 9</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:

(a) legally compliant? Yes ________ No ________
(b) sound? Yes ________ No ________

If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.

Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)

(a) justified? Not justified
(b) effective? Not Effective

(c) consistent with national policy? Not consistent with national policy (These criteria are explained in the notes.)

Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

The inclusion and treatment of existing Barton and Northway in the AAP is not at the level we would expect from PPS 12 and its requirements for Action Area Plans. As Priority Regeneration Areas in Core Strategy Policy CS3 they require more beneficial proposals and policies within their existing areas.

As far as we can see the AAP is in fact only really concerned with the Strategic Development Area. There are no policy statements or real analysis in relation to the regeneration of these areas within themselves and except one very weak policy (BA 20 Linking People to Economic Opportunities).
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

More consideration and policies regarding the regeneration of existing Barton and Northway.

Q1. Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of policies for Old Headington as included in AAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Do you consider that the document is:

| (a) legally compliant? | Yes | | No |
| (b) sound? | Yes | | No |

*If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.*

Q3. Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)

| (a) justified? | Not justified |
| (b) effective? | Not effective |
Q4. Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

We consider the inclusion of Old Headington and Ruskin Fields in the Area Action Plan without any analysis or policies as completely contrary to PPS 12 Area Action Plans. This area is particularly sensitive to change and there is pressure for development from Ruskin. The existing designation of being in a Conservation area is not a sufficient policy consideration especially as it is now proposed to be in an AAP.

The AAP must consider whether this site should be developed and the implications of any access.

We consider it an important wildlife lung into Headington linking right through Northway to Court Place Farm and therefore under Core strategy Policy CS 12 the AAP should develop policies to protect it. It is also very significant part of the setting of the conservation area and this should be re-affirmed in all its detail. It cannot be allowed to be subjected to haphazard development.

Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Policies should be included in relation to Ruskin Fields to which affirm its importance as a lung and nature corridor into Headington and its importance in the setting and landscape of the surrounding area.
Barton
Area Action Plan
Comment Form for Proposed Submission Document

Part A

PERSONAL DETAILS
(fill in Part A only once, no matter how many times you fill in Part B)

If you have appointed an agent, please show the agent's details in this section. Add your details (as client) in the last box.

Title
First name
MAURICE
Last name
DAVIS
Job title (where relevant)
Organisation (where relevant)
Address line 1
Address line 2
Address line 3
OXFORD
Address line 4
Postcode
0X3
Telephone number
Email address (USE CAPITALS)

*Client name and organisation
(where relevant)

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 13/03/2012

DATA PROTECTION
We will make your comments available to the public on paper at our Council offices, libraries or other suitable places, and will also publish them on our website.

We cannot accept anonymous comments. However, if you wish us to remove all personal details except your name and non-specific address (e.g. Oxford) before publishing your comments, please tick this [ ]
Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, I do not wish to speak</th>
<th>Yes, I wish to speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you answered Yes, please outline why you wish to speak*.

*Please note: the inspector will decide who to invite to speak at the hearings.

Do you wish to be notified of the following? (tick as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The submission of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The publication of the inspector’s report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adoption of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL ADVICE
For advice on making a comment please see the accompanying note which is also available at www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation.

When completing the form, please:
- use a separate sheet (Part B) for each comment
- cover concisely all the information and evidence you feel supports or justifies your view, as this will normally be your only opportunity to tell us about it, and
- be as precise as possible.

We would prefer you to submit your response using our online consultation system where possible. This enables us to analyse responses more quickly, reduces the time taken to record them, and is more environmentally friendly.

HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS
Please submit your response online at: www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation
or return the comments form by email or post:
Email: planning_policy@oxford.gov.uk
Post: Planning Policy, City Development
      Oxford City Council
      St Aldate’s Chambers
      109-113 St Aldate’s
      Oxford
      OX1 1DS

Responses must arrive at the council offices no later than 5pm on 23rd March 2012.

We will not accept comments arriving after this deadline.
DETAILS OF YOUR COMMENT

(please use a new Part B for each point you are commenting on)

Please read the accompanying notes before completing Part B. The notes explain what we mean by soundness and legal compliance.

**Q1.** Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Proposals map</th>
<th>Sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Q2.** Do you consider that the document is:

(a) legally compliant? Yes [ ] No [x]  
(b) sound? Yes [ ] No [x]

*If you have entered No to 2(b), please continue to Q3. Otherwise go to Q4.*

**Q3.** Do you consider the document is unsound because it is not: (tick one box only)

(a) justified? [x]  
(b) effective?  
(c) consistent with national policy?  

(These criteria are explained in the notes.)

**Q4.** Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound or not legally compliant. If you do believe the document is sound or legally compliant, you may use the box to explain why.

I am unhappy with the proposal to convert the existing rural character of STOKE PLACE into an urbanised route to and from the development. Its present informal state creates a pleasant and important link between the developed part of Old Headington and the semi-rural country side adjoining. Although the narrow nature of the ring road is now so heavily used, and very noisy, widening the bridge way, removing trees to do so and a "clinical" tarmac resurfacing will be the ruination of this vital peaceful track.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)
Q5. What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Unsound in respect of creating the so-called boulevard between Headright and Barton. The proposal to have houses facing towards the busy road will be a disaster for the residents from noise and pollution aspects. The housing should face away from the road. Removal of the central reservation with trees and shrubs should be maintained to soften the visual and audible impact of the busy road.

(Continue on a separate sheet or expand the box if necessary)

This is the end of the comment form.
With regard to the above, may I make the following comments/requests:

1. That the Barton Area Plan should be in the hands of the City Planning Department at all times.

2. That there should be many houses built for renting, the rent being set by the Council.

Of course there is a desperate need for affordable housing. Good housing in private hands is not likely to be affordable for those who need it.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs. S. Wernberg-Müller)
Dear Madam/Sir,
I enclose a letter which I would like to be formally accepted as my comments on the Council's proposed submission for land at Barton.
Yours faithfully,
Verity Hawkes
Dear Madam/Sir,

**Re: Barton Area Action Plan, Proposed Submission Consultation**

I would like this document to be formally accepted as my response to Oxford City Council’s proposed submission for the Land at Barton.

1. **Building houses along the A40 Ring Road, north side**

   In its objectives the council has pledged to be sensitive to the character of the area and to build a strong and vibrant community at Barton.
   
   The character of Barton is that of a large village giving out onto the countryside, protected from the ring road by trees, a nature park, an allotment site and green space. Barton is not a suburb or urban boulevard in character.
   
   Building houses along the ring road will therefore not fulfil or honour the planning objectives, and such house-building plans are insensitive to the locality and to the quality of life of local residents.
   
   As houses are now not to be built along the road’s south side, the idea of a boulevard is void. These houses facing a busy ring road are supposed to integrate Barton with other communities in Oxford. There is no evidence or rational justification for such a claim. These frontages will detract from, rather than build on, a strong local community. The council’s persistence, right from the start, with this aspect of the plan, and the Council’s imperviousness to local opinion and the lack of a clear alternative vision, i.e. to build on the locality’s existing strengths, lends no credibility or local support to the project.

2. **Destruction of nature park, felling of mature trees, building on statutory Allotment Land**

   There is no need to carry out any of the above destruction, since there is land enough for houses without destroying the nature park, felling mature, protective trees, or building on Statutory Allotment Land.
   
   There is in fact, in relation to national requirements re Public Open Space, a shortage of such sites in Barton, therefore, given the lack of any imperative to build on these spaces, they should be retained.
   
   Any pledge to replace the Nature Park is misleading since when they are built on, animals and plants die and sites and habitats are lost forever.
   
   There is no sure indication of how large any Bayswater Brook nature ‘Strip’ will be.
   
   There is no substitute for a local, small wildlife area, close to particular residents, loved by them and cared for by them, and the aim should be to emulate such examples of ‘green’ living, not destroy them.
The written and verbal pledges to retain the cultivated portion (now the larger part) of the Statutory Allotment Land will be hard to maintain since, now that the true boundaries have been drawn, it is clear that the Southwest corner of the cultivated land sits 25 metres away from the ring road. Previous stages of the consultation process have been based on incorrect boundaries. Therefore the Council may well be breaking its pledge.

In the Proposed Submission document the Council pledges (in line with its legal obligation) to replace any area of uncultivated Statutory Allotment Land used for building with allotment land, but then adds words to the effect of ‘or other community food growing projects’. This raises legal issues: Statutory Allotments must be replaced by similar status land, i.e. statutory Allotments. Any ‘community food growing projects’ would need to be on additional land, it is not within the council’s remit to decide on a change of land use, nor is it possible for the council to make any claims about future demands for allotments in a new, not yet existent community.

The allocation of land for community food growing, and for market gardens with, hopefully, opportunities for apprenticeships, would complement and add to the necessary allotment provision.

Incidentally, replacing allotments is extremely costly. Ask the Olympic Legacy company. Having one central allotment site facilitates the sharing of resources and skills, saves lots of money and could provide a central nexus, accessible to all parts of Barton, for this and other food-growing initiatives. Also, sited near the central recreation ground provides further possibilities for activities such as a food market, cafe etc.

3. Road giving bus access into Barton from Northway.

Providing pedestrian and cycle links gives far better access between local communities and better access to the countryside and to healthy exercise, and will be of benefit. However any vehicular road from Northway for buses can hardly be justified in terms of expense and disruption, since access to Barton could be achieved via the ring road only, if there is a ground level junction. No justification has been put forward for the degree of disruption a road would cause or any possible benefit to residents of Northway.

Already it is clear that the communities are distinct and that building a strong and vibrant bigger Barton is the objective to focus on. The lack of this focus so far has led to lack of local support, so that consultation has been more like coercion.

Thank you for your attention.

Verity Hawkes
Dear Adrian and colleagues,

Here is a comment on the submission document from Ruth and myself.

Best,

David

David Rundle
City Councillor (LibDem)
Headington Ward, Oxford

WANT TO HEAR THE LATEST NEWS IN YOUR AREA?

WANT TO RAISE AN ISSUE?

Come to our Ward Focus Meeting!
Tuesday 20 March, 6pm - 8pm,
Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre Lecture Theatre, Windmill Road
All welcome! Admission free!

For more information, visit www.headingtonlibdems.org.uk
Comments on the Barton AAP Proposed Submission

Submitted on behalf of Cllrs Ruth Wilkinson and David Rundle (City Councillors for Headington Ward, Oxford)

The document and the project that it seeks to move forward are warmly welcomed. The need for affordable housing in and close to the city of Oxford is well-known and, while what is proposed is too confined to meet the whole need, it will provide very significant assistance.

We also welcome the absence from the Proposed Submission of any mention of the proposal from Ruskin College to build on the fields that they own within the ring road. It is our concern that the inclusion of the Ruskin proposal would have severely undermined the soundness of the Submission document, for the following reasons:

- the proposal had not been subject to the same rigorous process of development and consultation as that for the Barton West site
- the traffic implications of building on the Ruskin site would have been created conflict with the access requirements to the main development and so undermine the effectiveness of the proposals for Barton West
- the proposal would have been in conflict with the status of the fields as an integral part of the Old Headington Conservation Area and thus open the AAP to challenge

While the intention of the document and much of its content is to be welcomed, there are two elements which are included which do damage to its soundness.

Policy BA1

The policy to convert the ring-road into a boulevard has met with derision in the local press. It is our concern that the proposals contained within this policy (outlined at para 2.2 and detailed in section 5) are neither justified nor effective. Our objections are as follows:

- The proposed arrangement of houses facing onto the ring-road is likely not to integrate this element of the new build but quite the opposite: it is in danger of alienating the residents of these houses from the existing and new communities of Barton.
- The reduction of the speed limit to 40mph is not supported by any measures to control traffic speeds and so is likely to be ineffective; if it were effective, its impact is liable to be to re-direct frustrated motorists onto other routes through and around the city, thus undermining the status of the ring-road. Such a downgrading of the ring-road is unjustified and counter-productive.
- The reduction of the ‘green barrier’ of the central reservation of the ring-road is not going to be effective in creating any meaningful integration of the community with the land within the ring-road and the loss of this vegetation is not justified

Policy BA6
The proposal to reduce the green space in the Northway estate to provide a bus route has created understandable opposition. It is our belief that the loss of green space is unjustified and the proposed bus route will be ineffective for the residents of the new part of Barton. It is also our concern that, despite the wish to have primary access from the ring-road, it is likely that for many residents exit at Green Road will naturally be the most attractive option. The information provided does not justify the belief that the main route of travel for residents will be onto the ring-road away from the Green Road roundabout.
WYATT Richard

From: Steve Gerrish
Posted At: 21 March 2012 12:52
Posted To: planningpolicy@oxford.gov.uk

Please find attached my response to your consultation on the Barton Area Action Plan (Proposed Submission Document), that closes on 23 March 2012.

Steve Gerrish
Kidlington
OX5 [redacted]

22/03/2012
Paragraph 7.2
The Council’s Sustainability Strategy is in preparation, and proposed reduction targets against a 2005 baseline are published in this paragraph. Are these targets compatible with the targets in the Climate Change Act? The Climate Change Act targets are set against a 1990 baseline. This is very important.

Paragraph 7.3
"The new homes will be expected to meet the latest sustainability standards set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes and reflected in Building Regulations. At present the Code is set to level 3, increasing to level 4 in 2013 and zero-carbon in 2016."

This does not state what the aspirations are for new housing in the Barton Area, and even implies that whatever building regulations are in force at the time of planning application will be used – i.e. minimum legal standards. These houses will be occupied 100 years from now, and 2016 is only 4 years away. The Council’s aspiration should be for Code Level 6, or at the very least satisfying the energy criteria for Code Level 6. It may be that only Code Level 5 is achievable, which may be acceptable because, from memory, Level 6 could be achieved by retrofitting so called ‘Allowable Solutions’ for low and zero carbon energy generation. i.e. the door to improvements may not be closed.

The developers will squeal loudly about this, and they must be ignored. There is a very big skills and training deficit in the building trade. If the Plan can insist on a high level of thermal efficiency for the construction of these houses, this would be an opportunity to develop a highly skilled work force that will go on to build more very good houses when zero carbon new housing becomes mandatory. It may be possible to pull in government funding for training, for to make zero carbon new housing a reality in 2016 there needs to be a large investment in training for house builders, especially for those getting their hands dirty.

To achieve a Code Level 5 or 6 aspiration, you will not only need training, but you will also need to provide special funding for your Building Control department. Everyone in the trade knows that what is specified in the architect’s plans and in the planning permission rarely happens properly on the day. Building Control must be funded to make visual inspections at every stage of construction, and they must include some unannounced inspections, and they must be given political support for being uncompromising in their rigour.

Paragraph 7.4
Having engaged at the consultation stage for the NRIA SPD in 2006 (or thereabouts), and having completed academic study recently around the energy efficiency of buildings, I would suggest that it is now not adequate to enforce the standards we should expect from new housing. It is now 5 or 6 years old, and much more is achievable by the building industry today. Those companies that have upskilled and adapted to new circumstances must be given the opportunity to continue their development.

Paragraph 7.6
Orientation of buildings is crucial, and important in achieving Code Level 5 or 6 for energy efficiency. It must not be compromised by desires to make streets ‘look attractive’. The orientation is paramount, and making the development ‘look attractive’ must operate within those boundaries. This will mean that the houses on the south side of the street will be a different design to those on the north side. (North–south streets, with housing on the west side and the east side, might need to be minimised or eliminated.)

Paragraph 7.13
Green corridors and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS). Two points:
i) I have heard that there was a proposal to relocate the existing nature area. This is a misguided notion. A nature area cannot be relocated. Each successive decade of a nature area's existence enhances its biodiversity. There will be a net loss of biodiversity if it is relocated, which will last a significant part of anyone's lifetime. To objectively describe such a proposal, you would need to say "we will destroy the nature area by building on it, and it will be substantially, but not entirely replaced in the year 2032 by reserving a new area right now".

ii) I have been informed by an attendee at a recent consultation meeting that the drainage on the site will be "green field or better". This is physically impossible. Green field is soil that is either cultivated annually or is permanently covered in vegetation (e.g. grass). Cultivation massively increases the infiltration rate of soil, so all the precipitation goes to groundwater. Cultivation, although not its primary purpose, is like annual maintenance of the drainage of soil that is unnaturally stripped of its vegetation. Uncultivated land is permanently maintained by nature - earthworms create drainage channels, and roots constantly penetrate the soil leaving channels when they die. Compaction of any kind drastically reduces the infiltration rate, both physically and by reducing or eliminating root growth and earthworm activity. Even cultivated fields are sometimes subject to runoff, with disastrous results.

SUDS makes use of infiltration ponds (attenuation ponds?) and permeable surfaces. Both of these will need maintenance forever. Permeable surfaces become impermeable without maintenance or regular replacement. The developer will be long gone by then. Remember that the promoters of these solutions are engaging in a marketing exercise when they inform you about them. The culture that pervades western democracies permits those engaged in marketing to be less than objective or complete in the information they provide, and for it to be "OK" for the "buyer beware" principle to dominate. The culture gives companies unwritten permission to mislead people.

A final point, which I think is not referred to in the document under consultation, but is nonetheless relevant. I understand that the sewage from the site cannot flow down hill to a treatment works, and that all of it will have to be pumped up to an existing site. This locks in a 100 years plus energy demand that compromises the City's ability to meet its emissions reduction targets. If sewage treatment cannot be done in an energy efficient manner, perhaps this is "the wrong place" from a geographical standpoint. You could be truly innovative and get an engineering consultancy to design a large storage tank that can be emptied into the existing network by solar and wind powered pumps. The storage capacity would need to be big enough to deal with the intermittency of the solar and wind energy.

This took me an hour and a half that I didn't have. I very much hope that you will take the opportunity, having decided to sacrifice this land, to create a first class example of a low impact development that will make the residents proud to be living there.

Steve Gerrish
Kidlington
OX5

21st March 2012
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<td>Details of why you think the DPD is unsound</td>
<td>There is very little consideration of extra congestion caused by this development. The Green Road roundabout is already very congested at rush hour and the proposed changes to the A40 (a major east-west national trunk road) will cause further delays and increased use of rat runs through local villages. I hope Oxford City Council is not ignoring these villages because they are not part of its constituency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes do you suggest to make the DPD legally compliant or sound?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Method</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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