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### Representation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structured Document</th>
<th>Barton Area Action Plan (Proposed Submission Document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation ID</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Alan Foulkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Date</td>
<td>23 Mar 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which paragraph do you wish to comment on? (please give relevant paragraph number)</td>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement OCC 2006 Page 12. Paragraph addressing outreach to hard to reach communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which policy do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant policy number)</td>
<td>The process of community involvement for the DPD in question should be in general accordance with the LPA’s Statement of Community Involvement (where one exists).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the DPD is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the DPD is Sound?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On which grounds do you consider the DPD unsound? (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Details of why you think the DPD is unsound | *"The consultation was fundamentally flawed. Not only was there no appropriate effort to effectively consult Barton residents, but there appears to have been an intention to mislead recipients of the questionnaire regarding the preferred options to respond in a way that agreed with the Council’s preferred options.* Question 7 referred to the nature Park as “scrubland”. It also suggested that that if the Nature Park was not built on the suggested Linear Park by the brook would have to be instead. Neither of these are true. The Nature Park has a large number of mature trees; because of flood risk OCC can not build within 8 metres of the bayswater brook.

It was stated that the answers to the questionnaire were taken into account and helped inform the Council’s final plan. Plans were based on flawed information.

This an example of **MALADMINISTRATION** and as such the plan is not legally compliant. |
| What changes do you suggest to make the DPD legally compliant or sound? | There needs to be another round of consultation that is not flawed. The Council needs to show that consultation was genuine. Plans to build on Barton Nature Park should be dropped |
| Submission Method   | Web                                                    |

This page was last modified on 23 Mar 2012 16:30 by Alan Foulkes
Consultation

Barton Area Action Plan (Proposed Submission Document)
# 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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>MR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>FRANKLIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>CHESMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>RETIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 3</td>
<td>OXFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>OX3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (USE CAPITALS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Client name and organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 22/03/12

### 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: [Tick]
Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?

| No, I do not wish to speak | Yes, I wish to speak |

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

The illogical idea of a crossing on a major trunk road within 15 miles of a flyover needs to be rebuffed at every opportunity.

*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)

| The submission of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document | |
| The publication of the inspector’s report | |
| The adoption of the Sites and Housing 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.

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) |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Paragraph | BA1 | Policy | 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? | | |
| (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.

The proposed A40 Northam Bypass juncion - traffic lights - roundabout will cause severe congestion on this major East/West trunk road. The need for this is to ameliorate the failure of the £20m Scheme to improve traffic flow around Green Road roundabout that did not improve Baywater Road exit onto the roundabout (no lights fitted). Traffic on the A40 west of Oxford at Cassingten and Eynsham where lights are used is subject to congestion and accidents, the same would occur at Northen as in the past before the A40 was made a dual carriageway.
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 new junction can be avoided by using the Marston flyover which is within 1/2 mile, but not suggested/proposed as the road would cross S.O.D.C. controlled land. This would require cooperation between councils that only a higher authority can achieve.

(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.

<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>
<tr>
<td>(b) effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) consistent with national policy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Bus access to Northway is not explained in the Boxen Area Action Plan. Other than saying it will cross the A40, any bus gate or camera enforcement has proved very difficult as with the JR Hospital Entrance (Saxen way) or the High Street Oxford. The estate could be used as a rat run. Emergency vehicles regularly using the small estate roads will also be very dangerous. The new access for buses will cross a protected green space into Foxwell Drive. The local councillor - Ray Darke - says Meaden Hill is not suitable for buses. The ACHIN Plan says buses will use Westlands Drive but this is a 200yd gap not explained in the Plan. The 2 bends at the end of Foxwell Drive are very hight and certainly not suitable for buses.

(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 solution is not to follow this proposal but improve Bayswater / Green Road junction as outlined in my comments in B.A.I.

(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.
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>MISS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>PAMELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>MOORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td>NORTHWAY ESTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 3</td>
<td>OXFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (USE CAPITALS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Client name and organisation (where relevant)*  

Signature: [signature]  
Date: 22.3.2012

**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
continued

Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?

| No, I do not wish to speak | Yes, I wish to speak |

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)

| The submission of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document |
| The publication of the inspector’s report |
| The adoption of the Sites and Housing 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.

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.

<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? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) sound? Yes</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>
<tr>
<td>(b) effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) consistent with national policy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The policies as they stand cannot be deliverable as they are in direct conflict with assurances given concerning the Foxwell Drive Green Space.

(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.

Area Aehin plan indicates that the junction or roundabout will allow only bus or emergency vehicles access to Northway. How is this to operate as assurances have been given that Foxwell Drive green space is protected and any buses coming from the new development will not come down Meaven Hill. Westlands Drive is cited in the Area Aehin plan but access to Westlands Drive means some motorists crossing the protected green space of Foxwell Drive. The access to Northway therefore has to be removed from the plan.

(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.
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: MR.
First name: PETER
Last name: SHAW
Job title (where relevant): TREASURER
Organisation (where relevant): STOKE PLACE RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION
Address line 1: [Redacted]
Address line 2: HEADINGTON
Address line 3: OXFORD
Address line 4: 
Postcode: [Redacted]
Telephone number: [Redacted]
Email address (USE CAPITALS): 
*Client name and organisation (where relevant): 

Signature: [Redacted] Date: 22 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: [ ]
Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?

| No, I do not wish to speak | Yes, I wish to speak | YES |

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

I (or a resident nominated by me) wish to speak on behalf of approx. 20 residents who live beside the rural byway and bridleway which the Council proposes to ‘upgrade’ as a cycle/pedestrian route between Headington and the new development. We are the people whose immediate environment would be irretrievably damaged by the changes put forward in para. 5.33 of the BAAP Submission document.

*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)

| The submission of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document | YES |
| The publication of the inspector’s report | YES |
| The adoption of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document | YES |

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.
Part B

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>5.33</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>BA7</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 Not Sound

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? [ ]
(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.

We believe the proposals set out in BA7 and in paragraph 5.33 for the ‘upgrading’ of Stoke Place to be unsound. They are not justified for the following reasons:

Conservation and the Historic Environment

The Council’s proposals are insufficiently detailed, but it is clear that the bridleway would be very unlikely to survive as a narrow rural pathway after an ‘upgrading’ process which includes resurfacing, lighting, and thinning trees.

This public way has been in existence since Roman times and before; remains from various eras have been discovered in different places along the route. Policy SP51 in the Council’s proposed submission on the Sites and Housing DPD (para B2.119) draws attention to the archaeological importance of the Ruskin site, with its traces of Iron Age and Roman use; Stoke Place shares that history.

Both the byway and the green bridleway sections are historic survivals highly valued as one of the heritage assets of the Old Headington conservation area. This is made clear in the Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted July 2011) on pp 63-4. It is the Council’s responsibility to preserve and enhance such features, and Stoke Place is already in a fragile condition.
The Natural Environment

The byway (and particularly the bridleway section) are both areas where native plants flourish in season close beside the cycle/pedestrian way (see sample list of species attached); this is emphasized in the Conservation Area Appraisal (p. 64).

The bridleway is part of a local wildlife corridor, providing a pathway or habitat for birds and mammals such as jays, green woodpeckers, bats and foxes, deer and rodents precisely because of the present lack of traffic, lighting, noise, or disturbance.

Traffic and Safety

The "Stoke Place" route from south to north consists of three quite distinct sections: the Byway, which is a cul-de-sac with green verges and no pavement and which carries traffic associated with the houses and Ruskin College; the Bridleway, currently used by pedestrians and a small number of cyclists, and finally a Footpath to Elsfield, which begins on the far side of the A40 and is very underused. It will be good to see the footpath brought back into use by pedestrians. However, we consider the Stoke Place sections to be entirely unsuitable for increased cycle and pedestrian use for reasons of traffic and safety.

Stoke Place has a steep gradient, rising 20m in all from the 75m spot height at the northern bypass end to 97m spot height where Stoke Place meets Dunstan Road.

The steepest section is the 9.5% gradient of the metalled part of Stoke Place byway running north to south between house No. 10 (spot height 87.5 m) and the entrance to Stoke House (spot height 93.3 m). This is particularly hazardous since it is also the narrowest section of the byway (2.74m and only a car's width for 20 metres from the Ruskin College service road to the entrance to Stoke House). Pedestrians and cyclists are often obliged to seek refuge in gateways or hurry to get out of the way of vehicles.

This stretch of the byway carries cyclists going south-north and freewheeling downhill at speeds of up to 20 mph, as well as their opposite numbers: cyclists struggling uphill or pushing bikes. Both groups will find the hazards of their journey much greater when the Ruskin staff car park opens later this year, and generates a flow of traffic entering and leaving the service road in the opposite direction to the peak time movement of cyclists.

The combination of cars, pedestrians, cyclists and drive-entrances here will produce a text-book hazard and a high risk for all users of the byway section. We estimate a minimum of 30 double journeys (by cars, PSVs, delivery lorries) each day up and down Stoke Place byway to the service road when Ruskin College returns to full use in Autumn 2012, plus additional traffic flow between Dunstan Road junction and Stoke House.
In Ruskin College's 2011 annual report a student figure of over 3,000, is quoted, plus 75 staff. A significant proportion of these are likely to come to the Headington site by car, particularly those taking courses which involve brief attendance at the College. The byway section of Stoke Place will reach saturation point as far as traffic is concerned. Danger 'flash' points for cyclists especially going downhill are Stoke House entrance, Ruskin Service Road entrance, gateways of houses no. 8 and 9, all of which will create a potential conflict for different road users.

Legal Implications and Effectiveness
We believe that the proposal to upgrade Stoke Place is unsound because it is not deliverable, for the following reasons:
The ownership of the southern section of Stoke Place has never been legally established. It is a Byway Open to all Traffic, and its status as a roadway is "unadopted". A majority of the current residents will contest any proposal for adoption and/or any major changes proposed by the Council that would affect its intrinsic character as a rural lane in the Conservation Area. The very reason that most of us have chosen to live here are the features that adoption or upgrading would diminish if not destroy. A portion of the bridleway section is owned by Ruskin College, but not the entire bridleway. This is evidenced by Land Registry Document Title No ON26907.

As with many public ways of this kind, the legal position is problematic, and the right of the Council to make significant changes may not be easily established. This is very likely to create delays and impediments for the BAAP.

Public Opinion
The weight of public opinion as evidenced by the two most recent relevant Council Consultations (Conservation Area Appraisal and BAAP Preferred Options) is consistently strongly favour of keeping Stoke Place as it is and retaining its rural character. In the case of the Conservation Area Appraisal 46% of respondents highlighted this, and in May/June 2011 the majority was strongly opposed to the adoption by the BAAP of Stoke Place as a crossing point for cyclists and pedestrians for exactly the same reason. That option polled only 63 positive responses of a total of 500+. The Council is obliged to pay due attention to this; it is evident that not only local residents but walkers and cyclists from other parts of Oxford love Stoke Place for its special rural character, and resist the very idea of it being 'upgraded'.

In the same consultation the majority expressed a strong preference for a perfectly viable alternative for the principal cycle and pedestrian link: the route via Foxwell Drive which could link the community north of the A40 with Headington/Northway in a more sustainable and less environmentally damaging way (see response to Question 5 following.)
We propose that any reference to using Stoke Place as a main cycle link or to upgrading it be removed from the BAAP Proposed Submission.

We support the proposed cycle track via Foxwell Drive as the principal route for cyclists and pedestrians who cross from north to south side of A40 ring road.

The Foxwell Drive route was the option preferred by a large majority of respondents as set out in the report of Preferred Options published in December 2011.

There are sound reasons to favour this option (other than the preservation of Stoke Place):

- **It is far less steep than the proposed Stoke Place route**
  and is therefore accessible to more users and less dangerous (especially when travelling downhill).

- **It is very much wider than Stoke Place**
  and so minimizes competition between walkers, cyclists, and cars for the same patch of road space.

- **It would provide easy access to the John Radcliffe Hospital**
  through the bus entrance in Saxon Way.

- **It would be easier and cheaper to implement:**
  the required surface and lighting are already in place over a large part of the proposed route.

- **It would be less environmentally destructive** than the Stoke Place route.

- **It already provides a link from Foxwell Drive** to the wider cycle track network.
Part B

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>5.1-4 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 [ ] Not Sound

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? [ ]
(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.

We wish to register our strong objection to the proposal to "transform the A40" near Headington, Barton, and Northway, into "a street running through the city", on the grounds that this is completely unrealistic and is a potential disaster in the making.

Section 5 in the Draft Submission for the BAAP contains a series of ideas based on planning theory rather than on the reality of the situation north of Old Headington.

The A40 is a main road carrying heavy traffic round Oxford as quickly as possible, and as such it is a masterpiece of town planning which current proposals would completely destroy.

Far from being what the document describes as "a noisy and visually dominating physical barrier that separates Barton and its surroundings from the rest of the city" it is in fact almost completely invisible from Headington, Northway, Barton, and the land to the west of Barton.

Thanks to sensitive engineering which took advantage of the natural dip in the land, and the retaining of belts of green along the perimeters, backed up by planting of shrubs and trees, this road has as little impact as could reasonably be asked of a four-lane bypass.

There are currently three green buffers which defend Northway, Barton, and Old Headington from the worst of the traffic and pollution: mature trees and shrubs each side, and a thick green central reservation in the middle, which keep all these areas reasonably free from noise and pollution. The development west of Barton will benefit from this protection as well.

Doing away with the measure deliberately created to improve the lives of those living nearest the ring-road to create a "street running through the city" so that residents on either side of four lanes of traffic feel that they all form part of the same community is wishful thinking.

Furthermore, the green fringes lining the northern bypass provide a cushion between the Old Headington conservation area and the A40; and we need to bear in mind that these and all the fields and green spaces within the ring-road round Oxford are vital not just as a natural local amenity but as providing the wider landscape setting of Oxford; they must be preserved at all costs, and not sacrificed to an unproven theory of "integration".

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.

Remove the unsubstantiated claims about making the ring road into a street that runs through a city, re-align the proposed housing to face the community of which it will actually form a part.
Part B

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>1.1-9 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 [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ]
(b) sound? Yes [ ] 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? [ ]
(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.

We wish to record our strong support for the Council's decision to restrict this plan to land north of the Ring Road, and to exclude Ruskin College's proposals for a housing development on the historic meadows between the existing buildings and the Ring Road.

Extending the Barton plan to include development on this land to the south of the Ring Road would have an adverse impact on the Old Headington Conservation area. The Old Headington Conservation Area Appraisal received strong endorsement when it was presented to the City Council, and was adopted without opposition. This demonstrated that this Council (like their predecessors) recognized that Old Headington is a special asset for Oxford and must be preserved for posterity.

Stoke Place Residents’ Association
OLD HEADINGTON
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
DIANE

Last name
REEVES

Job title (where relevant)

Organisation (where relevant)

Address line 1

Address line 2
Headington

Address line 3
Oxford

Address line 4

Postcode
OX3

Telephone number

Email address (USE CAPITALS)

*Client name and organisation
(where relevant)

Signature:  
Date: 17-3-12

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:  

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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)

- The submission of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document
- The publication of the inspector’s report
- The adoption of the Sites and Housing 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.

<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? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) sound? Yes</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>
<tr>
<td>(b) effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) consistent with national policy? Yes (These criteria are explained in the notes.)</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. |

Unable to read accompanying notes as taken off internet.

(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.

It seems that the council are rail roading their proposed building project with website errors in these official documents. Defunct website addresses and incorrect email addresses, say no more, also telephone no does not exist.

(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.
Notes on completing Part B

We have published the Barton Area Action Plan (AAP) for consultation before we submit it for examination by an Independent Planning Inspector. Any comments received will be considered by the City Council and the Inspector.

In these notes we explain the criteria that the inspector will use and that you should also use when commenting on the plan.

The planning inspector will consider whether the document:

- complies with the **LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**; and
- is **SOUND**

**LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

To comply with the legal requirements, the Barton AAP must:

- be identified in the Local Development Scheme;
- have involved the community as set out in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement;
- be published in line with the procedure for publishing a policy document, as set out in the regulations;
- have involved the production of a Sustainability Appraisal Report;
- have regard to national policy and conform generally to the South East Plan; and
- have regard to the Oxford Sustainable Community Strategy and Oxfordshire Sustainable Community Strategy.

**SOUND**

To be sound the Barton AAP must meet these the Tests of Soundness criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be justified</th>
<th>Be effective</th>
<th>Be consistent with national policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on robust and credible evidence, the document should:</td>
<td>The policies should be deliverable, and the document should:</td>
<td>Where the DPD differs from national policy, there must be clear and convincing reasons to justify the difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide evidence of community participation in its production</td>
<td>- Include plans for providing supporting infrastructure;</td>
<td>Please check: that you have stated why differing from national policy makes the document unsound; that you have given details of what the document should say; and that you have provided evidence for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- be backed up by facts;</td>
<td>- face no barriers to delivery in the form of regulations or national planning law;</td>
<td>If you are concerned about a potential omission, please check whether the issue is covered elsewhere in national policy or in another Development Plan Document. If the issue is covered elsewhere, there is no need for us to repeat it in the Sites and Housing DPD and this would not in itself make the document inconsistent with national policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- offer the most appropriate strategy when compared with reasonable alternatives; and</td>
<td>- identify partners who will help deliver it;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- show how the policies are sustainable.</td>
<td>- fit in with the strategies of neighbouring authorities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- be flexible enough to adapt to changing circumstances; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- allow monitoring against targets linked to the Annual Monitoring Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL ADVICE
If you are seeking a change to the document, please check that you have:

- made it clear in what way the document is unsound in regard to the legal requirements and tests of soundness set out above;
- stated precisely how you think the document should be changed;
- supported your comment with evidence showing why the document should be changed; and
- provided all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify your comment and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a later opportunity to comment further.

If you are part of a group who share a common view on how the document should be changed, it would be very helpful for that group to send a single response that represents the view, rather than for many individuals to send in separate comments that repeat the same points. In such cases the group should state how many people it represents and how it has been authorised to do so.

Further detailed guidance on the preparation, publication and examination of DPDs is provided in PPS12 and in The CLG Plan Making Manual.

Useful links

- Local Development Scheme; Statement of Community Involvement; Sustainability Appraisal; Annual Monitoring Report: http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decP/Planning_Policy_occw.htm
- Planning Policy Guidance Note 12: http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pps12isp (see particularly paragraphs 4.36 – 4.47, 4.51 and 5.52 and the boxed text)

If you would like further advice, please contact the Planning Policy team at:
planning.policy@oxford.gov.uk

01865 252847

---

1 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2 A programme of work, setting out the documents the Council proposes to produce.
3 A document that sets out a strategy for involving the community in preparing policy documents.
4 This includes publication of appropriate supporting documents, placing an advert in the local press and notifying any persons who have requested to be notified, as set out in the regulations.
5 A tool for appraising policies to ensure they reflect social, environmental and economic factors.
6 The South East Plan sets out the region's policies in relation to the development and use of land.
7 Plans for the local area that are prepared by the Local Strategic Partnerships.
8 Soundness is explained fully in Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning.
9 This monitors progress towards delivery of plans and policies.
As a resident of Beckley I wish to express my concern regarding the likely increase of traffic at Barton, which is already causing problems of congestion and hold-ups at busy periods on the road to the green road roundabout. The provision of a new access road to the Ring Road between the roundabout and Howta where a speed limit of 40 mph now is proposed is likely to exacerbate the situation.

Access to Oxford and the main roads from the village in this area using the B4027 daily is already a concern.
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
Last name
Job title (where relevant)
Organisation (where relevant)
Address line 1
Address line 2
Address line 3
Address line 4
Postcode
Telephone number
Email address (USE CAPITALS)

*Client name and organisation (where relevant)

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

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: [ ]
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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><strong>YES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The publication of the inspector's report</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adoption of the Sites and Housing Development Plan document</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>BA1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</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? [ ]
(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.

**PLEASE SEE ATTACHED TWO SHEETS (TYPED BOTH SIDES)**

(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.

**PLEASE SEE ATTACHED PAGE**

(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.
OBJECTION TO POLICY BA1

1. The Barton Area Action Plan is unsound because Policy BA1 does not adopt the most appropriate strategy for handling the relation of the new extension to the A40 compared with reasonable alternatives.

   The fundamental objection to Policy BA1 is that it would oblige the developer to build as many new homes as possible directly fronting the A40, exposing them to the full impact of the heavy traffic on this major traffic route. It also proposes to destroy green hedges and trees on the north side of the A40 and on the central reservation in a way that will make the A40 more dominant in the landscape rather than less. A better pattern of development would be to keep the existing hedge and trees along the north side of the A40 and build behind them, possibly setting the homes nearest the A40 at a right angle to the main road, creating new, friendly neighbourhood streets.

2. The policy set out in BA1 stems from the council’s choice as its preferred option to “transform the ring road into a street with speeds of 40 mph and new development facing the road.” The introduction to Section 5 says the council’s aim is “to transform the A40 into a street running through the city rather than dividing it.”

   But the council in last minute changes to the Action Plan has already, in deference to strong objections, dropped the idea of building new homes on the edge of the Northway estate facing the Barton extension. The residents of Foxwell Drive were allowed to keep the hedge and trees, green space and children’s recreation ground which the council itself originally created to buffer the homes on the estate against the A40. The council has also dropped including in the Action Plan the controversial proposal by Ruskin College to build on part of its fields next the A40. These were deliberately included in the Old Headington Conservation Area to protect its historic and rural character. The historic character of Old Headington is a precious inheritance which must be protected.

   The Action Plan therefore no longer includes any building on the south side of the A40. The council’s proposed “street” will have only one side. The council should now follow through the logic of its previous changes and abandon entirely the idea, when developing on the north side, that a major highway like the A40 can realistically be turned into a city street. Persisting in the attempt to realise this concept will in practice have damaging consequences.

3. The Barton extension is welcome because it promises to provide the city with more urgently needed new homes, particularly affordable ones. Barton is well placed to be a source of homes for people working in Headington’s hospitals and research centres and at Oxford Brookes.

   The Action Plan confidently states (5.3) “The ring road will be transformed to ensure it is no longer a noisy and visually dominating physical barrier that separates Barton and its surroundings from the rest of the city”. Three measures are put forward to achieve this. The speed limit on the A40 between the Marston flyover and the Green Road roundabout is to be reduced from 70 mph to 40 mph, which the Action Plan claims will reduce traffic noise. The Action Plan says the lower speeds will also allow the creation of a new light-controlled road junction for the Barton extension on the A40, which would also give access for buses only to the Northway estate. New crossings would also be provided for pedestrians and cyclists.
Finally, “To avoid any sense of separation between the new neighbourhood and the rest of Oxford, new homes will be built fronting onto the ring road” and the green central reservation will be relandscape.

4. Some of this is clearly sensible. A new road junction on the A40 will stop residents in the new homes having to go back and forth through Barton to the Green Road roundabout. An extended Barton will need extra bus services and a buses-only connection between the A40 and the city’s road network would be helpful. New pedestrian and cycle links across the A40 are obviously required.

But an examination of the details also suggests that the council is being optimistic about the degree to which its proposed measures can totally change the character of the A40, a major traffic artery.

The Action Plan talks of “multiple safe and easy to use crossings for pedestrians and cyclists”, but in fact is proposing only two, or at the most three, new ones. The only two specifically shown in the Action Plan are one incorporated in the proposed new road junction at Northway, and one at Stoke Place, reconnecting Old Headington to Barton and the countryside beyond, which might take the form of a bridge.

The Action Plan says that “lower speeds will reduce the noise levels for the new development as well as for those living in surrounding communities.” But, apart from the noise that may be created by traffic starting and stopping at the proposed new junction, the A40 is noisy not just because of the speed of the traffic but because of the amount it carries. This is evident on the ring road in Sunderland Avenue. The 40 mph speed limit there is fairly well obeyed because it covers a short stretch of road between two roundabouts. But, standing on the pavement at busy times, the dominant impression is still of traffic noise.

Clearly the proposed 40 mph speed limit on the A40 will be most easily enforced where drivers see they are approaching traffic lights. But enforcement may prove more difficult over the whole of a long stretch of dual carriageway where the temptation to overtake will be available. It is a fallacy too that the sight of houses will affect the behaviour of drivers. This can be seen where the four-lane ring road passes through Botley. Drivers observing the 50 mph limit in the inner lane frequently find themselves overtaken, including by lorries.

None of this is an argument against imposing a 40 mph limit, but the council would be wise not to expect too much from it. Hopes that traffic noise can be reduced substantially on the A40 are likely to be disappointed and should not be made the basis of policy.

5. The inescapable reality is that the A40 is both a busy section of the Oxford ring road and part of a major national traffic route, carrying long distance traffic between London, Cheltenham, Gloucester and beyond. The rejection in the early 1990s of the Government’s scheme to divert the A40 round Barton and North Oxford means that the present road will remain a national traffic artery for the foreseeable future. The sheer volume of traffic that it carries means that it will remain a noisy and divisive physical barrier, crossable safely only at fixed points, whatever aspirations may be embodied in Section 5 (Introduction and paragraphs 1 to 4) of the Barton Action Plan.
6. From the end of the Second World War until now, Oxford city planners had a policy of trying to protect new homes built next the ring road from the noise and lights of heavy traffic by requiring where possible the provision of a green buffer with hedges and trees. The council should not abandon this approach unless the reasons are compelling.

The A40 Northern Bypass was originally built as three-lane highway with a shared central passing lane and became notorious for accidents. When in 1971 the stretch between the Banbury Road and Green Road roundabouts was dualled, care was taken to enhance the trees and hedges, including one in the centre of the road running almost all the way between the Cherwell Bridge and the Green Road roundabout. This forms an attractive crash barrier and protects drivers from the lights of oncoming traffic. The existing Barton estate is, like Northway, buffered against the A40. The main road is cut into the hillside, curving up to the Green Road roundabout.

The result is that the prevailing impression along this stretch of the A40 is, to a remarkable degree, of greenery. The dual carriageway has been fitted very successfully into the surrounding landscape.

7. The proposals in 5.3 and Policy BA1 would change this. The developer of the Barton extension would be forced by council policy to adopt a layout that “maximises the scope” to provide homes fronting the A40, although living in this situation would probably not be the first choice for any new resident.

Visually, the effect would be damaging. Green hedges and trees would be replaced by houses set behind a service road, looking like ribbon development from the 1930s. These would be likely to show up in views from a distance. The Action Plan, surprisingly in view of the present successful landscaping, describes the A40 as “visually dominant.” The proposed pattern of development with its destruction of greenery, far from reducing the visual impact of the A40, would increase it.

Socially, the proposed layout would be even more destructive. The residents facing the A40 would be compelled to look out on a heavy flow of traffic and be deliberately exposed to its fumes, noise and lights. Children would come out of their front doors onto a service road, dangerously placed next a major national traffic artery. What is the sense or humanity in this?

The Action Plan adds (5.3) “The central reservation is well planted with mature vegetation. This forms another physical – albeit green – barrier between the strategic development site and the rest of Oxford. This should be relandscaped to be more in keeping with a street running through the city.” Since the council has rightly dropped the proposal to build houses on the other side of the A40 on the Northway estate, the only practical result of this proposal, apart from destroying the natural safety barrier in the centre, would be to give the unfortunate residents in the new homes a clear view of four lanes of highway instead of just two.

The Action Plan suggests that building houses fronting the A40 will “avoid any sense of separation”. But the residents will not feel they are living in anything that resembles a normal city street. They will be all too aware that they have been forced as a result of council policy to live facing a snarling stream of traffic on a road which they can only cross safely at two, or perhaps three, fixed points. The service road, although visible from the A40, will only be reachable through Barton. The closest connection of the new residents will be with Barton.
The most that can be said for the policy of building new homes fronting the A40 is that it may help to advertise physically the existence of the Barton extension to passing traffic. But the price to be paid by the residents in the shape of poor living conditions is far too high.

8. The Action Plan claims as an advantage of building houses fronting the A40 that it would make the best use of land. But it is hard to see why. The plan shows the new houses would have a service road with car parking and a pedestrian and cycle way in front of them. This road would serve only one set of houses instead of two as in a normal street.

An alternative lay-out would be to retain and enhance the existing trees and hedge along the A40. Behind the hedge, a natural safety barrier, there could be pedestrian and cycle ways leading people to the designated points at which the A40 can be crossed safely. The new homes nearest to the A40 could be set facing each other in streets running at right angles to the main road. If the nearest buildings to the A40 had solid windowless walls and gable ends facing towards it, they could still be set reasonably close to it.

These neighbourhood streets would be likely to have a far more relaxed and friendly atmosphere than the row of homes looking at and dominated by the dense traffic on the A40 proposed by the council.

9. The Action Plan rightly says that it is important that the new neighbourhood feels part of Oxford. But persisting with an Action Plan which involves building homes with poor living conditions facing a busy national traffic artery will not contribute to this or to the attractiveness of the new extension. It may indeed lead to Barton earning the reputation of being a place where new homes have to be chosen with care and some should be avoided.

The way to make a success of the Barton extension is for it to become known as a suburb of the city where people can find well-designed, high standard homes which have easy access to the countryside, good bus services and safe connections across the A40 for pedestrians and cyclists.

The way to show that Barton is not out of sight and out of mind but a valued and integrated part of the city is for the council and the developer to avoid the mistakes made at Blackbird Leys in the 1960s when the building of new houses ran far ahead of the provision of amenities. The council and the developer must ensure in practice as well as on paper that the facilities for which people have asked such as shops, primary school, medical centre and recreation areas are delivered at the same time or ahead of the building of new homes. Residents are most likely to feel part of the city if its council delivers the goods.

The council should drop completely the flawed concept that the A40 can be turned successfully into the equivalent of a city street. It should adopt instead a lay-out that preserves the present successful green landscaping of the A40, continuing previous policy, and protects the new homes from the direct impact of the heavy traffic along what is both a well used section of the Oxford ring road and a national traffic artery.

end
CHANGES NEEDED TO MAKE THE BARTON AREA ACTION PLAN “SOUND”

Delete Policy BA1 and substitute something on the following lines:

**Policy BA1 Barton and the ring-road**

Links between Barton and the rest of Oxford will be strengthened. A new surface-level junction will connect the Barton extension to the A40 and a new connection between the A40 and the city’s road network will be provided for buses only. New pedestrian and cycle routes across the A40 will be created. A 40 mph limit will be imposed on the A40 to lower the speed of traffic approaching the junction.

Planning permission will only be granted for a layout for the Barton extension that protects residents as far as possible from the noise and disturbance of the heavy traffic on the A40. Care must be taken to protect and enhance the existing green landscaping of the ring-road and in particular to prevent new houses protruding into views from the Old Headington Conservation Area.

The following consequential alterations should be made:-
Amend 2.2 removing in particular the sentence: “Lower speeds and less traffic noise will allow development to front on to the ring road, reducing its visual dominance and the sense of separation.”

Amend Map 1 to delete the rows of houses fronting the ring road

Rewrite 5.1 to 4 to accord with the new wording suggested for Policy BA1 and remove or replace the illustrations. Remove the claim that “The ring road will be transformed to ensure that it is no longer a noisy and visually dominating physical barrier that separates Barton and its surrounding from the rest of the city” and the reference to “multiple” safe and easy to use crossings. Remove the proposal to build houses fronting the ring road and the reference to this avoiding separation. Remove the proposal to relandscape the central reservation.

5.11 Remove the reference to “the creation of new frontages along the ring road to help transform it into a street.”

Amend Map 5 to remove the frontages on the A40

5.32 Remove the reference to “multiple” crossing points on the ring road since only two new crossings are shown.

7.19 Delete reference to a residential frontage on the northern side of the ring road. Possibly add a reference in section 7 to the need to design the buildings nearest the ring road in a way that protects residents from disturbance by its heavy traffic.

Delete 9.5 entirely
**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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>MRS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>ANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>DOYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td>HEADINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td>OXFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>OX3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (USE CAPITALS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Client name and organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| No, I do not wish to speak | Yes, I wish to speak |

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)

- The submission of the Sites and Housing Development Plan Document
- The publication of the inspector’s report
- The adoption of the Sites and Housing 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.

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)

| Paragraph | 5.33 | Policy BA 7 | 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? [ ]
(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.

a) Stoke Place is one of the few surviving rural lanes in Old Headington and is important to the character of the village.

b) Providing a fast well-lit and surfaced route between Barton and Headington will inevitably result in much greater usage of Stoke Place. What I object to is the increase of cycles in Darstone Road, St. Andrew's Road and Osler Road which are already congested by cars and are a dangerous "rat run." Unless the cycle tracks can be provided these roads are already very dangerous for cyclists.

c) A footbridge between Foswell Drip and the new development would be a far better alternative.

(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.

(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.
Notes on completing Part B

We have published the Barton Area Action Plan (AAP) for consultation before we submit it for examination\(^1\) by an independent Planning Inspector. Any comments received will be considered by the City Council and the Inspector.

In these notes we explain the criteria that the inspector will use and that you should also use when commenting on the plan.

The planning inspector will consider whether the document:
- complies with the **LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**; and
- is **SOUND**

**LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**
To comply with the legal requirements, the Barton AAP must:
- be identified in the Local Development Scheme\(^2\);
- have involved the community as set out in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement\(^3\);
- be published in line with the procedure for publishing a policy document, as set out in the regulations\(^4\);
- have involved the production of a Sustainability Appraisal Report\(^5\);
- have regard to national policy and conform generally to the South East Plan\(^6\); and
- have regard to the Oxford Sustainable Community Strategy and Oxfordshire Sustainable Community Strategy\(^7\).

**SOUND**
To be sound\(^8\) the Barton AAP must meet these the Tests of Soundness criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be justified</th>
<th>Be effective</th>
<th>Be consistent with national policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on robust and credible evidence, the document should:</td>
<td>The policies should be deliverable, and the document should:</td>
<td>Where the DPD differs from national policy, there must be clear and convincing reasons to justify the difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide evidence of community participation in its production</td>
<td>- Include plans for providing supporting infrastructure;</td>
<td>Please check: that you have stated why differing from national policy makes the document unsound; that you have given details of what the document should say; and that you have provided evidence for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- be backed up by facts;</td>
<td>- Face no barriers to delivery in the form of regulations or national planning law;</td>
<td>If you are concerned about a potential omission, please check whether the issue is covered elsewhere in national policy or in another Development Plan Document. If the issue is covered elsewhere, there is no need for us to repeat it in the Sites and Housing DPD and this would not in itself make the document inconsistent with national policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- offer the most appropriate strategy when compared with reasonable alternatives; and</td>
<td>- Identify partners who will help deliver it;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- show how the policies are sustainable.</td>
<td>- Fit in with the strategies of neighbouring authorities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Be flexible enough to adapt to changing circumstances; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Allow monitoring against targets linked to the Annual Monitoring Report(^9).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL ADVICE
If you are seeking a change to the document, please check that you have:
• made it clear in what way the document is unsound in regard to the legal requirements and tests of soundness set out above;
• stated precisely how you think the document should be changed;
• supported your comment with evidence showing why the document should be changed; and
• provided all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify your comment and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a later opportunity to comment further.

If you are part of a group who share a common view on how the document should be changed, it would be very helpful for that group to send a single response that represents the view, rather than for many individuals to send in separate comments that repeat the same points. In such cases the group should state how many people it represents and how it has been authorised to do so.

Further detailed guidance on the preparation, publication and examination of DPDs is provided in PPS12 and in The CLG Plan Making Manual.

Useful links
• Local Development Scheme; Statement of Community Involvement; Sustainability Appraisal; Annual Monitoring Report: http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decP/Planning_Policy_occw.htm
• Planning Policy Guidance Note 12: http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pps12lsp (see particularly paragraphs 4.36 – 4.47, 4.51 and 5.52 and the boxed text)

If you would like further advice, please contact the Planning Policy team at:
planning policy@oxford.gov.uk

01865 252847

---

1 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2 A programme of work, setting out the documents the Council proposes to produce.
3 A document that sets out a strategy for involving the community in preparing policy documents.
4 This includes publication of appropriate supporting documents, placing an advert in the local press and notifying any persons who have requested to be notified, as set out in the regulations.
5 A tool for appraising policies to ensure they reflect social, environmental and economic factors.
6 The South East Plan sets out the region’s policies in relation to the development and use of land.
7 Plans for the local area that are prepared by the Local Strategic Partnerships.
8 Soundness is explained fully in Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning.
9 This monitors progress towards delivery of plans and policies.
Planning Policy,
City Development,
Oxford City Council,
St. Aldates Chambers,
109-113 St. Aldate's,
Oxford
OX1 1DS

Dear Sir,

Barton LAAP

Please find enclosed the comments document for consideration by the Planning Inspector and made by the Board of Trustees of Barton Community Association. Can you confirm receipt of this document by e-mail to bartonnhc@aol.com.
We understand that all comments received will be displayed on your website. What is the timescale for this?

Can you please let us know who will be responsible for summarising the comments received, and will we have sight of the summaries before submission to the Inspector?

We look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours faithfully,

Dr. Simon Heap
On behalf of Trustees
Barton Community Association
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
Dr

First name
Simon

Last name
Heap

Job title (where relevant)
Volunteer Trustee

Organisation (where relevant)
Barton Community Association

Address line 1
Barton Neighbourhood Centre

Address line 2
Underhill Circus, Barton Estate

Address line 3
Headington

Address line 4
Oxford

Postcode
OX3 9LS

Telephone number
01865 761987

Email address (USE CAPITALS)
BARTONNHC@AOL.COM

*Client name and organisation (where relevant)

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 22-3-12

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
continued

Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?

| No, I do not wish to speak | Yes, I wish to speak | Yes |
---|---|---

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

We would like the opportunity to comment further on our summary points of objection

*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)

| The submission of the Barton Area Action Plan Document | Yes |
| The publication of the inspector’s report | Yes |
| The adoption of the Barton Area Action Plan Document | Yes |

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: planningpolicy@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.
BARTON AREA ACTION PLAN

COMMENT FORM FOR PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

CONSULTATION WITH THE COMMUNITY - In principal we are very much in favour of the housing development covered by the LAAP (in the same way that we were not actively opposed to the suggested development of Ruskin Fields which has now, for whatever reason, been abandoned) We acknowledge the severe need for housing in the area and do not wish to stand in the way of further housing stock being built. However, we do not want significant decisions being made without better, more inclusive consultation with the present Barton community.

The role of the Barton Community Association is to fairly represent the existing community of Barton. We do not feel that appropriate and transparent consultation has so far taken place, and that views of local people have not, in the main, been taken into account or just ignored and seen as time wasting in the eyes of Oxford City Council. A fine example of this is the questionnaire that was circulated during autumn 2011, and which the Barton and Northway Working Group (BNWG) had no say on at the time of its development. The questionnaire was quite clearly produced in an unacceptable format, so much so that most local people were unable to understand the questions being asked. The document was largely incomprehensible, difficult to grasp detail, both in general and more specifically, and was not written in a way that would allow its content to be easily understood by the majority of intended readers. This is contrary to the stated aim in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement of 2006 Page 12 which states:

“There have historically been a number of groups considered to be ‘hard to reach’. ‘Hard to reach’ groups are traditionally considered to include young people, disabled people, frail older people, homeless people, people with literacy difficulties, people from the traveller community and black and ethnic minority groups.

The City Council will be proactive in paying particular attention to these groups by making involvement relevant and accessible in order to broaden the number of people who can, and perhaps more importantly, want to be involved. This may include producing documents in different formats where necessary (e.g., large print, availability of Language line). We will consider location, the timing of meetings and ease of access when arranging events aimed at involving people, and try to avoid holding consultations in the school summer holidays. We will experiment with special ways to attract people in areas of the City where attendance at previous events has been low. We will pay particular attention to producing documents in plain English that are as easy to understand as the jargonistic field of planning will allow”

There are some schools of thought who would say that the community’s low educational levels have been taken advantage of. As a whole Barton is not a population able to sit down and read long and complicated documents on what has been proposed and respond with views that can be written down in English. Meetings for open public discussion would have undoubtedly aided the building of comprehension and confidence in the project.

It has been suggested that an outline 3-D model be produced so that those who have difficulty in reading leaflets and reports can easily grasp what was planned, and that model could be amended and added to as the project progresses. This would give local people a much better understanding of
the overall impact that this new development will have on the surrounding area. This has so far not been forthcoming.

We felt that the whole process was a tick box exercise on the part of the planners, and that the members of the BNWG were an inconvenience to City Council’s agreed plans. The BCA representatives on the BNWG feel strongly that the meetings themselves were poorly chaired by Council staff, operated without any clear Terms of Reference and that lip service was paid to the community representatives sat around the table. The whole process has not been participatory and inclusive. We also felt that verbal feedback through open discussion at arranged public meetings would have been a better means of communicating generally with the local community, but, again, this has not happened.

INTEGRATION – Residents within the existing Barton estate have expressed strong views as to how integration can be achieved, and a singular community created (that is to name the new development the same as the existing estate – Barton). The existing Barton has many strong features: a vibrant community, a stable core of long-term residents and an influx of younger families from home and abroad, a well used community centre, new sports facilities including the Leisure Centre and the Sports Pavilion together with an extensive public transport and cycle network. However, Barton is also classed as an area of deprivation (amongst the lowest 20% in the country) with relatively low educational attainment, significant long term, illness among individuals, unemployed youths (NEETS) and occasional bouts of low level crime. It will be crucial to work together to see how the best bits of existing Barton are transferred to the new Barton development in a mutually reinforcing and sustainable way, and that the problems of existing Barton are tackled more vigorously not only there but also are minimised in the new Barton development.

There have been many suggestions forthcoming covering a wide variety of elements. We value our open green spaces and have received no reassurance that this will be present in the new development. We have asked questions about housing allocation, knowing that changes to current procedures will take time, but nothing concrete has been spoken of. We still have no idea how many dwellings are likely to be built. The imprecise 800 – 1200 dwellings seems a vast window to be working with. More precision would be appreciated. We have suggested that a small proportion of the new housing could help relieve the overcrowding in some Barton properties or allow for existing residents to down size to more appropriate homes and so allow for personal integrative processes to retain extended families in Barton.

We still cannot comprehend how all the S106 monies can be allocated to a new primary school without any consultation whatsoever. At no stage have we been asked what we would like to see the money spent on or at least a small proportion of it. We have produced a wish list as we were advised to do prior to the existence of the BNWG, but this has generally been ignored ever since. This would include broadband access for every household, keep fit playground for the elderly, a post office and a pot of money identified for future small projects to be managed by BCA to make for a successful, inclusive, participatory expansion of Barton through this important housing development which we want to succeed.

ENVIRONMENT – Policy BA4/5.6 & 5.16 There is no evidence to prove that a linear park will provide a genuine trade off for the proposed loss of the Nature Park. Barton is already underprovided with green spaces (refer Oxford’s draft Green Spaces Strategy). This proposal simply seeks to re-distribute
the existing total area of green space, still leaving Barton underprovided. These objections have previously been raised with City Planning by way of petitions and site visits that included representatives from the Council for the Protection of Rural England. We are expected to approve plans that include several open ended words such as “may”, “expected”, “possible” and “potential”. We have requested but have not been provided with any real evidence of the appointed developers’ record of compliance with the standards described within the proposal document. Comparable site visits were promised but never came to fruition (Policy BA12).

The policy (BA1 5.6) shows no evidence that the existing planting and green areas are, in fact, a barrier to integration. Removal of green spaces and trees, together with building frontages onto the ring road, will serve only to bring Barton closer to the next area of landscape or building. Current residents value the semi-rural aspect of Barton and no evidence has been provided to show that there is a great desire on the part of residents to lose this individuality and privileged position within Oxford City.

Barton Community Association

21st March 2012
Dear Planning Policy Team,

You will I hope with all the acknowledged power you have oppose the unneeded and commercially driven Barton Area Action Plan covering Barton, Northway and Old Headington which if accomplished would not solve housing need, would constitute not building a world-class city for everyone, would wrongfully damage and destroy Green Belt
land, and rural wildlife, fields and plants, habitat as a very bad bazaar, act of environmental vandalism and would go against a current trend to preserve all green areas from green consciousness in any country from rain-forest to rural. The need to protect leisure areas and an unspoiled green environment without the AAP's environmentally damaging proposals. Please read my accompanying letter I sent to the editor of The Oxford Times which is enclosed highlighting my opposition to the AAP.

The AAP if constructed would be if constructed and is a damaging, execrable and totally condemnable project of out-of-date industrial-style luxury and stupidity of a vile ugly scar anti-green nature.

Will you do your utmost to oppose the AAP and to prevent it coming to fruition and its construction? You should
do so taking into account the monstrous and naive plan.

I am a long-term resident of Barton and I was born in Oxford in 1952 and I have lived on Barton from that year and I know Barton and Oxford and Oxfordshire very well.

I write as an ardent supporter of nature, nature conservation and the natural environment with a sensible, common-sense and rational outlook.

The Area Action Plan covering Barton, Northway and Old Headington should be cancelled.

Yours Sincerely,
Dear Editor,

An attack by Professor Audrey Mullender (report, November 10) on opponents who oppose a 150-home development on Old Headington fields by stating they overstated the attractiveness of the fields, that they make it sound like a wildlife wonderland about to be put under concrete, and there are opportunities to combine ecological awareness with sympathetic development reveals her way of thinking is based on unwelcome sarcasm and thoughts of simple-minded intellectual back-
wardness which in itself is very wrong and misguided.

In trying to pave the way for a property development of housing stock whose primary aim is not to house students but is a pecuniary one of trying to make money for Ruskin College and developers, she tries in unwelcome and ungrainly haste to diminish the unspoiled and attractive nature of the natural landscape, makes a misleading claim the development will knit together as a sympathetic whole based on ecological awareness which are contradictory claims that are stupidly naive and not true reality.

Roads envisaged in the plainly absurd plan and that for Barton West by Oxford City Council in fields to the west of Barton would be ugly horrible scars and highly unwelcome and nasty addition to an at present pristine and beautiful natural landscape.

In the light of the view of the green movement and sensible environmentalists to preserve diminishing green lands which including that of the rain and the lessening number of butterflies and the pain and the lessening number of butterflies and birds including thrushes and sky larks by way of habitat destruction it would seem sad and absurd to
Build housing for the West of Barton project in the Green Belt.

The attempt by Professor Mullender to make new housebuilding appear trendy while ignoring the need to preserve the green environment is based on unprincipled, short-sighted opportunism. Her argument is emotional and without wise judgement and should be rejected.

Supported as she is in poor argument by Oxford City Council it claims it needs to build homes by way of the Barton West project to house 6000 on the waiting list for housing, a project which has no genuine desire to house revealed by it allowing private flat build at Gloucester Green opened by Andrew Smith, M.P and in caving by Brookes University to build student accommodation on land at Headington. By supporting a private development at Gloucester Green which people on the waiting-list cannot afford.
it has deliberately obstructed social housing provision and affordable housing.

The attempt by the Government to ruin villages and the Green Belt by development by way of abandoning planning controls, the Mrs Thatcher P.M M40 motorway extension as a destroyer of countryside and car-mod phenomena, a local farmer who ripped out lines of trees and hedges, the proposed HS2 Chiltern and Oxford City Council desire to ruin biodiversity and unspoiled scenery via a peculiar bulldozers.

People on Barton wish to retain all the fields around Barton as they now are as a pleasing visual entity, green environment and for walking pleasure.
For Oxford City Council to build 1000 houses as envisaged in the Barton West project will not alleviate housing need but would satisfy the miasma guided nature of overly economically greedy property developers.

The Oxford City Council report in the Area Action Plan deliberately ignores preserving the Green Belt around Barton with over-inflated publicity about creating a world-class city via a narrow-minded viewpoint that is misleading and wrong and based on a puerile business model.

As a long-term resident of Barton I know the naturalness of countryside near Old Headington and fields around new Barton are far superior to the repulsive and unnatural elitism of Professor Mullender via educational privilege and that of Oxford City Council as it puts nasty avarice before decent common sense.
Building a BMW plant on Oxfordshire countryside, unfortunately, means more to Oxford City Council than decent common-sense.

With the elitist arrogance Oxford City Council displays, it should be allowed to sideline and marginalise Barton opposition to the Barton West housing project by way of a hastily convened public enquiry in a nasty attempt to push it through in a crude commerce regardless of common-sense.

It should cancel the Barton West project as it has the Headington and Ruskin Fields one and in order to serve those with proper and enlighten thinking based on green enlivened thinking and stop playing a silly and ornamentalism and stop playing a silly and stupid game of power-mad divide and rule.

Yours Sincerely,