

APPENDIX 2

Public Consultation

Public consultation comments received can be summarised as follows:

Statutory Consultees Etc.

- **County Council:**

Commented on contributions under CIL The County Council as Fire Authority has a duty to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available for fire-fighting purposes. There will probably be a requirement to affix fire hydrants within the development site. Exact numbers and locations cannot be given until detailed consultation plans are provided showing highway, water main layout and size. We would therefore ask you to add the requirement for provision of hydrants in accordance with the requirements of the Fire & Rescue Service as a condition to the grant of any planning permission

- **Highways Authority:**

See main body of report. Raised no objection; Supports the revised bridge location at the end of Gt Clarendon St and a car free development. Pedestrian (only) access to the bridge from the main square should still be possible in front of the residential element of the proposal. Any housing would need to be excluded from the Residents Parking Zone. The bus stop on Canal Street may need to be relocated (secured by S106 contribution).

- **County Drainage Engineer:**

All extensions / developments which increase the size of the hard areas must be drained using SUDs methods, including porous pavements to decrease the run off to public surface water sewers and thus reduce flooding. Soakage tests should be done to prove the effectiveness of soakaways or filter trenches.

- **Environment Agency:**

Raised no objection to the application as originally submitted, subject to the inclusion of a number of conditions including mitigation measures, SUDS, contamination. However, they have objected to the revised plans as the FRA has not been updated to assess the impact of the new bridge type and location in relation to flooding risk.

- **Natural England:**

The application site is within or in close proximity to the Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is a European designated site, and therefore has the potential to affect its interest features. European sites are afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended (the 'Habitats Regulations'). The site is also listed at a national level as Port Meadow with Wolvercote Common & Green Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England raises no objection to the SSSI or Habitats Regulations Assessment. It advises that the proposal is not necessary for the management of the European site and that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on any European site, and can therefore be screened out from any requirement for

further Habitat Reg Assessment (HRA). NE recommends in recording the HRA that the likelihood of significant effects regarding controlling of dust and dirt from demolition and construction processes, and potential recreational impacts upon the SAC given the increase in housing and new access being created over the canal, are justified.

In respect of the SSSI NE considered the proposed development will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the site has been notified and therefore no conditions are requested.

- **English Heritage:**

Raises an objection to the height of the Community Centre/ boatyard building in respect of the setting of the listed St Barnabus Church and views from the canal. (see main body of report)

- **Network Rail:**

After studying the details submitted on this proposal, Network Rail submits a holding objection pending further investigation regarding land ownership at this location as this development may possibly (either directly or indirectly) affect land owned by Network Rail. It should be noted that despite the length of time lapsed they still have not clarified their ownership or commented further.

- **Thames Water Utilities Limited:**

Water Comments: On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application. However, TW comments that the peak surface water discharge rate of 83.21 l/s (for a 1-IN-100 wet weather event, including 30% increase for climate change) is deemed too high for a development site of 0.47 hectares. The peak surface water discharge rate from the proposed development will consume 11% of the receiving pumping station's maximum pump rate. This is excessive when considering that the development site constitutes approximately 1.15% of the receiving surface water pumping station's catchment. Surface water on new ('Greenfield') sites, or sites that have never previously discharged surface water to the public sewer, should be restricted to five litres/second/hectare pro-rata for developments less than a hectare, assuming there are no reasonable alternatives such as SuDS, or a direct outfall to a nearby watercourse. The developer is advised to review their surface water drainage strategy in line with current accepted discharge rates for new connections to the surface water system.

Sewerage: Thames Water would advise that with regard to Foul sewerage infrastructure we would not have any objection to the above planning application. Adjacent to the site to the south is St Barnabus (Oxford) Surface Water Pumping Station.

- **Canal & River Trust:**

Objects on the grounds of design of the Community Centre/ Boatyard buildings adjacent to the Oxford canal.

Community/ Boatyard Building:

The Canal & River Trust has no issue with the proposed materials, or general architectural expression of this building.

Object to the imposing nature of the building due to its size and massing, and the impact this will have on the canal corridor, Conservation Area and on the Grade I listed St Barnabas Church. This issue is emphasised by the building being located immediately adjacent to the offside bank, with an overhanging balcony element to add interest and break down the imposing nature of the elevation.

Alteration from the single gable facing the new public square with 3 smaller gables has improved the aspect of the building from the south and from the square itself. However the impact on the canal corridor, especially from the north, obscures any view of St Barnabas' Church and does not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The increased eaves height (in order to accommodate a badminton court) has made the building more imposing upon the canal corridor than the previous single-gabled proposal.

Canalside housing:

Large expanse of patterned brickwork along the entire elevation of the canalside housing is visually uncomfortable; suggest reducing to one or two units only or use of a single shade of brick or alternating colours.

Ratio of solid to void inappropriate; glazing dominates the façade and the recessed roof terrace/balcony appears incongruous in the area, particularly with the angled dividing walls and forward projecting chimneys.

Location of Bridge:

The Trust has held numerous meetings with both the applicant and Council in order to agree a bridge location and type.

Their position has always remained unchanged; preference would be for a fixed bridge located at the southern end of the site. The applicant maintains that this is not possible and has therefore amended the submitted plans to show a lift bridge at the southern end of the site,

For the avoidance of doubt, the Canal & River trust will not agree to the provision of two new bridges at the site.

The Trust raise no objection to a lift bridge at the southern end of the site provided that it is fully automated and maintained including a call out mechanism in the event of mechanical failure, at no cost or liability to the Trust in perpetuity.

The Trust will require adoption of the lift bridge by the local authority or an alternative and no less robust and secure management regime to be put in place to deal with future costs and liabilities.

Bridge design :

The revised plans appear to show a part fixed, partially lifting bridge. The Trust cannot confirm whether this type of bridge will be deemed acceptable to navigational safety without further information.

The Trust would prefer that the canal is narrowed with a lift over the narrows, rather than the unconventional design shown.

If planning permission is granted, a condition should be imposed requiring the approval of alterations to the canal, bridge details to include a robust method of dealing with its future maintenance and operation.

Boatyard & community facilities:

There are other boatyard facilities available on the Oxford canal but the key additional feature being progressed for Jericho's boatyard is the ability to undertake 'DIY works'.

The development should be phased to ensure that the community facilities, including the winding hole, bridge and boatyard are provided in a timely manner as these facilities are integral to the success of the scheme.

Comments as landowner/landlord

The bridge will result in the loss of visitor moorings. Replacement moorings will need to be created elsewhere in the vicinity. An alternative stretch of the canal bank to the north of the Mount Place Bridge on the Western bank of the canal (which is currently not designated for moorings) could be used to provide replacement moorings. The costs associated with the provision of these moorings should be met by the applicant. As this land is likely to be outside of the application site it is expected that this matter should be covered by a S106 planning obligation.

In addition to the waterspace itself, the Canal & River Trust retain a 0.5m strip of land alongside the development length. Any specific proposals impacting on this will need our express permission.

Third Parties

- **Jericho Community Association**

Background for CC requirements:

The JCA has run the existing Community Centre in Jericho since 1980 in partnership with St Barnabas Church and Oxford City Council.

Despite the difficulties of dealing with an old building not designed for purpose, JCA has ensured that the centre has been soundly managed and self-supporting. In recent years it was one of the few Centres in the city to achieve the **VISIBLE** accreditation as a well-run Community Centre. It receives no regular grant funding but has managed to deliver on a business model which has consistently maintained balanced finances.

It derives its main income from two main sources: hiring rooms for classes and renting out other rooms on a monthly basis to small organizations, charities and artists. This has proved a very efficient way of operating on a sustainable basis.

On the basis of this sound practice and experience they drew up a business plan for a new Centre. This project was started some 14 years ago and over those years extensive research has been undertaken on what constitutes a good facility

designed for the needs and opportunities of the 21st century and also on the preferences of the existing and potential users.

Their philosophy has been to achieve the most flexible, high quality facilities which will meet the widest range of needs in this part of the city, in some part replacing what they already have and also to provide what does not already exist.

They have based the main Hall on the 'Village Hall specification' which is supported by Sport England and identified a reasonable combination of other spaces in order to generate sufficient income to continue to run a completely self-sufficient Community Centre in new premises.

The business plan has been updated over time and has been scrutinised at two previous planning applications and found to be robust in its assumptions, including that of dimensions and size. Outline planning permission for a Centre based on the same dimensions adjacent to the Church was granted without any objection. More recently in 2013 as a contribution to preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document the business plan was scrutinised by the City Council's officer with responsibility for Community Centres and also commended.

This demonstrates that JCA has based the requirements of the Community Centre on sound business principles supported by existing good practice.

Community Centre:

The reason the Hall appears to compromise the setting of the church is not because JCA is being over-ambitious or unrealistic, it is because the developer has placed it over the Boatyard. We do not believe the community facilities should be compromised by this fact.

The internal space on the second and third floor has been reduced in the revised plans. The new configuration reduces from 5 to 4 the number of toilets in the rear section of the Centre which provide facilities for both 2nd and 3rd floors and places them in a less convenient arrangement. It also reduces the circulation and storage space. There is a reduction in the number of toilets from 3 to 2 on the ground floor which serves the café and exhibition space. These are issues that compromise the effective running of the Centre on a daily basis especially at busy times.

The greatest concern is that one of the rooms on each of the second and third floor has been considerably reduced in size. This means that there is less flexibility in how these rooms may be used. As the JCA will be relying on income from renting the space, a reduction in floor space will lead to a reduction in income.

As we stated in our response in July a reduction in size in any aspect would not be sustainable. It is our view that these reductions compromise the viability of the Community Centre and we therefore object to these changes.

Affordable Housing:

The amended application does not increase the percentage of affordable housing on the site. We repeat our strongly held view that this is unacceptable.

The Bridge:

We object strongly to the position for the bridge. Creating a vibrant and lively amenity will rely on drawing pedestrians and cyclists through the square.

Moreover, the viability of the Community Centre, and in particular the café, will depend to some extent on 'passing trade'. In addition, the local history display area within the Centre will be aimed at for those who pass casually by as well as those who already have an interest in the historical aspects of the canal.

The proposed position of the bridge, away from the public square, will draw people away rather than through the square. In their view this will seriously compromise the success of the whole development.

- **Oxford Civic Society**

Object to this application, on the grounds of the failure to comply with specific policies, and the consequential likely significant harm to the social fabric of this important part of the city. We also object on the grounds of harm to the local environment, as a result of the appearance of the community buildings, the obscuring of important views of St Barnabus Church, and the impairment of its setting, and on the harm to the economic viability, and thus the deliverability of the community facilities, an important element of the specific policies contained in the relevant SPD.

Fundamental objection to the failure to provide 50% affordable housing. Not convinced by the viability argument for reduced provision of affordable housing. Policy requirements have been in place well before commencement of development of the current proposals. Therefore no legitimate reason why the site value, a critical factor in determining viability, should not have been established in full recognition of all the policy requirements.

50% is further justified by the recent release of the latest SHMA figures for housing requirements; showing increased demand against the background of increase in unaffordability of housing in the city. This is of particular significance to this site, since the character of the community, across a wide cross-section of society is an important element in the social make-up; thus especially important to provide affordable housing at full market rates, to avoid progressive harm to the social character of the neighbourhood.

A further consequence of the design proposal is the impairment of the viability of the boatyard and community accommodation, resulting from the 'stacking' of these facilities, a feature which contributes to the concerns expressed by English Heritage, which they endorse.

The design proposed is unsatisfactory in terms of the appearance and also jeopardising their deliverability. If the community facilities as designed cannot be delivered, important elements of policy as detailed in the site SPD will not be fulfilled.

- **Jericho Living Heritage Trust**

Notes that the main elements of the necessary provision as stated in the SPD are present. However, the site layout raises a number of issues which call into question the acceptability of the overall application:

Housing:

The allocation of the whole of the southern part of the site to luxury market housing has several undesirable effects:

- It contravenes the required 50% proportion of affordable housing. This is inappropriate in the Jericho Conservation Area, which is characterised by historic small (2-storey) low-cost housing for the working population of this early industrial area of the city;
- A row of up-market luxury housing is out of character with this stretch of canalside, which was a working canal boatyard;
- It concentrates too much of the other necessary facilities into too-restricted a space at the north of the site, resulting in tall and bulky buildings on both sides of the square which impact unfavourably on the listed church as well as the public square itself.

Community Centre and Boatyard:

Both of these have requirements clearly defined in the SPD, and it is essential that these are met to ensure the continuing viability of both.

Combining them in one structure inevitably produces one very large building, which detracts from the fine setting and cuts off views of St Barnabas Church which, through the opening-up of the public square, should be offered from a wide range of points along the canal towpath.

Changes to the roof profiles of the main northern block reduce slightly the impact of the building when viewed from the southern towpath, and its overbearing on some properties in Dawson Street. But the increase in the eaves height of the canalside building has a negative effect on views of St Barnabas Church from the northern towpath.

Concerned that the proposed reduction in facilities for both the boatyard and community centre may threaten the long-term viability of either or both, and reassurance on these points needs to be provided through robust revised business plans for each.

It is not clear that noise and vibration generation from the boatyard operation, without complex and very costly separation, will not affect the use of parts of the community centre.

There appears to be no guarantee of the on-site canal moorings which are essential if the boatyard is to be a continuously viable operation.

Aware of the unresolved cost escalation which may well make the community facilities undeliverable

Restaurant (and affordable housing) Block.

The height of this combined building would restrict views from some points along the towpath - and which would in particular obstruct the original line of sight of the Radcliffe Observatory along Cardigan Street. Minor modifications have gone some small way to improve the appearance.

It could be argued that these concerns should be balanced against the opportunity

to at last get this site developed as an asset for Jericho and the City. But it is difficult to be confident at present that the scheme will deliver anything other than expensive – and highly profitable – housing.

Almost complete vacuum of information about the arrangements for the public square. The public square is central to the success of the whole scheme; but no clarity on its physical characteristics, its future ownership (and therefore the values that will determine its use), the business plan that will ensure its maintenance as an outstanding asset.

Bridge:

Whatever the merits of an at-grade DDA compliant bridge at the south end of the site may be, the creation of a bridge connection across the canal to link the towpath to the public square remains an essential component of the design of the square, if it is to retain its vitality and serve a full and varied community function. Therefore object to these proposals in so far as such a direct link is not provided.

- **Jericho Community Boatyard:**

JCBY are broadly in favour of the plans for the boatyard building and are confident that it will be possible to deliver and run a thriving DIY boatyard in the space provided. A local boatyard is essential for the safe conservation of the boats of the Oxford narrowboat community and would be of inestimable social benefit.

It would be extremely difficult to provide the necessary services to the Oxford community and visiting boats without onsite moorings being granted to the boatyard.

Wet and dry docks:

Research was carried out by JCBY members and the Jericho Wharf Trust on the requirements of Oxford area narrowboats and their numbers.

Three docks (1 wet and 2 dry) will be the minimum adequate for DIY boaters and professionals to be able to carry out the necessary maintenance work to keep them all afloat and in good repair. Having a combination of the two will make this an exemplary yard that will interest visitors and aid the smoother running of the yard.

Workshops :

The professional workshop next to the docks has enough space for a decent boatyard workshop, with separate areas for mechanical engineering and carpentry and other professional work to be carried out by a boatyard manager and assistants.

The DIY workshop space (behind the community centre) gives space for small businesses (carpentry/artisanry etc) to be run from there as was possible in the workshops in the old boatyard. There will also be space for work tables that can potentially be used for DIY by boaters and Jericho residents. They also hope to use it to run courses in the evenings and at weekends.

If an agreement can be reached, these facilities could also be made available to

College Cruisers (likewise the docks) in order to help maintain the hire boat fleet which has been a feature of the Jericho canalside for so many decades, but which will be operating from within a greatly reduced space.

The chandlery, office and storage space provided by the plan will all help with the efficient running of a thriving boatyard.

The showers and temporary accommodation units will give boaters somewhere to sleep and wash while they are having work done/doing work on their boats. This is an essential for an 'equally accessible and suitable' boatyard, where Oxford people whose boats are their homes are able to avoid both a long journey for essential maintenance and also the need to find expensive alternative accommodation while undertaking the work.

Bridge:

A swing bridge to the north brings up a number of conflicts of interest. The boaters don't want it where it is because it will cause navigation problems, the JCA do because they want 'footfall' into the square for commercial reasons. A conflict of interest between those wanting a leisurely walk and those purposefully trying to get somewhere (by Bike)

From a boater's point of view, the original location of the bridge is too close to the turning circle and stands to complicate boat manoeuvres and they foresee problems with boats, for instance if an engine cuts out, backing out of the turning circle into the bridge (which could be up, down or moving). Incidents like this are bound to happen and could lead to injury and damage to the boats and bridge. The congestion caused by the proximity of the bridge to both the winding hole and the docks is highly likely to be problematic.

The location and type of bridge will necessarily affect the number of moorings and potential moorings at the site. As swing and lift bridges require the pinching of the canal, with vacant passing moorings on either side, this means that at least one potential mooring space will be lost on the boatyard side of the canal in addition to the two towpath-side moorings (one on either side of the bridge) that will necessarily become waiting spaces for those travelling under/past the bridge, wherever it is located. They would prefer a fixed bridge.

Onsite moorings are needed for several reasons:

- Boaters with 9-5 jobs to be able to leave their boats for the Boatyard Manager to be able to move in and out of the docks when the owner is absent. This is absolutely essential for the efficient running of a successful boatyard.
- ADIY boater to fit out their boat needs to be able to moor it next to the yard to easily move to and from it to the workshops. It would make this work difficult if this distance is too great.
- Boats with electric engines need somewhere to charge their batteries in the winter when there is less light and are prevented from doing so simply by solar panels. As a forward-looking community, more and more boats are converting to electric and this should be supported by the boatyard by providing electric charge points.
- Visitors' moorings are needed so that people will come and visit the chandlery

(and the café and restaurant!) and see the facilities for future work that they might need doing. The space is clearly available along the wharf front to provide these moorings and they would be of benefit to the whole square as well as adding to its atmosphere.

Building heights:

Seems ludicrous to JCBY that a building in as sensitive a spot as this (in front of St Barnabas Church) should be built so much higher than it needs to be for the sake of the unnecessary official height of a badminton court.

The restaurant block with the affordable housing on it, is a floor higher than the three floors stipulated by the council and from an aesthetic point of view encroaches onto the southern side of the square and blocks the treasured view down Cardigan St to the observatory. The square should be as large as possible and the views of it open, so as to attract visitors.

The view down Cardigan Street from the school end would remind people that the square is there and even allow a view of passing boats on the canal or the market on market days that might entice people in or simply be a happy reminder of it being there.

Affordable housing and the hybrid boatyard-community centre:

JCBY objects to the shortage of affordable housing on site. 32% is not the council's required 50% and the developer appears to be ignoring this stipulation.

In addition, JCBY accepts the professional advice that in order for this hybrid boatyard-community centre to be built an extra £1.6-£2 million extra will have to be found by the community to build it, due to sound-proofing, deeper foundations and suspended floors now having to be built which two lower buildings would not have required. This is all necessary in order to enable the developer to make space for four more houses to be built on the site.

However, by raising the price of the boatyard-community centre by £2 million, the developer stands to make several million pounds more profit while making the new centre unaffordable to those who need it.

It is to be hoped that the developer will agree to pay this extra amount in order to make the centre buildable as – with swiftly rising mooring and licence fees – boaters can ill-afford to pay the higher prices that might be necessary to service an extra mortgage or loan of this kind.

• **Individual Comments from residents:**

General:

Support:

- Planning application will provide much needed facilities for Jericho and the canal community.
- Strongly support the following aspects of proposal:

- Bridge
 - Square
 - Proposal for community boatyard and community centre with the facilities and capacity set out.
- Application is better than previous proposals and generally support the designs/ plans. Overall design is interesting and effective.
 - Proposal for the site are a vast improvement on these provided at earlier stages. Overall design is good and has a number of successful sections including form of the public space, elevation design of community building and overall design of southern house.

Objection:

- Objection to size not principle.
- Design is over bearing/out of character.
- Over development
- Proposal has ignored urban context of site context is dominated by The Radcliffe Observatory which is clearly visible up the length of Cardigan St, from the edge of the canal.

Community Centre/Boatyard/ Canal:

Community centre should not be above boatyard. Greater expense to the community – community centre above the boatyard more structurally complex therefore more costly. Rise in cost to build community centre and boatyard seems daunting and uncertain what will happen if money not raised. Development should offer compensation to ensure community centre can be adequately funded.

Height and design of proposed community centre appears industrial in scale and inconsistent and out of keeping with character of conservation area.

Location of community centre will lead to too much noise and air pollution

Any boat-repair facility should have control of some adjacent moorings, both for boats to wait temporarily either prior to or after accessing the dock and for ease of access for boats requiring quick in-water attention. No allocation of moorings would make boatyard operation practically and financially impossible. Provision of moorings is essential.

Core work of boatyard will create noise which will affect the community centre.

Boathouse/community centre is too large, height will dwarf the church/blot the site.

Wooden slatted appearance does not compliment church.

It [the community centre] may be bulky which would be detrimental to the canal side views from various angles.

The frontage is too close to the canal and unalleviated as it runs strictly parallel to the water, it creates a 'canyon like' edge similar to the frontage of development further north.

Objection to the demolition of the existing college cruisers [building], which is visually pleasing and adding to the canal side scene.

Generally welcomed, new community spaces are likely to be well used

Limited disabled access to community centre, more storage space should be provided

Concern about type of lighting that may be used, may affect people with neurological disabilities who are unable to cope with fluorescent lighting.

Works, facilities or land undertaken or gifted by developer should be for the Jericho community as a whole. Boat yard is not inclusive, more inclusive facility should be provided.

Community centre is minimum size, no objection to appearance of boatyard/community centre and like the idea of big hall with windows looking out into canal.

Scale of community buildings is appropriate

Residential:

Flats appear blocky and unattractive

There should be interesting brickwork and old style windows.

Dislike design of chimneys, should be lowered.

Type of housing is not in keeping with general type of housing in Jericho.

Fewer private dwellings

Please of lowering of height of the southern residential block.

House prices will dramatically change character of the immediate area

Proposed dwellings too close to garden/rear of house at 13 Barnabas St. this results in significant loss of sunlight and poor outlook. The height of proposed dwellings makes this particularly harmful. Proposed dwellings in breach on 22m back to back separation distance.

Not against development as such, would not wish to see windows in elevations visible from the rear of 10 – 13 Canal Street as this would look directly into garden or rear of the house.

Loss of privacy and light to 14 St Barnabas Street, excessively overbearing and not justified, overlook into garden and kitchens. Development should have a more typical footprint with larger gardens to prevent overlooking and 2 storey terraces

Significant loss of light and privacy of 12 St Barnabas Street.

Shadowing from housing development

Loss of view from back garden

Three stories is too imposing and depth is uncharacteristic, block views and obscures light from surrounding houses and leaves insufficient canal edge space for public use.

Affordable Housing:

Not enough affordable housing, 50% affordable housing should be achieved. Increase in house prices, strong objection to 32% affordable housing

Non-affordable housing units are larger than those in surrounding streets and out of character

Opportunity to specify that affordable housing built be sheltered housing for older people. Affordable housing should be allocated to the elderly as sheltered housing

Too many houses in a small area of insufficient affordable housing.

Separation of affordable housing is an issue.

Traffic and Parking:

Car free means that residents of the new development would not be eligible for a Jericho CPZ permit.

Unclear as to how principle of car free development can be enforced

Give more disabled parking spaces.

Concerns over traffic, especially Great Clarendon Street due to restaurant

Concerns of cycle traffic through square, cyclist must dismount at all times.

Cycling safety issues on pathway that follows Sheepwash Channel will intensify. Regulations should be enforced and cyclist redirected along Rewley Road. Barriers should be installed to force dismount and reduce speed of cyclist

New house owners will park in permit only spaces

Encouragement should be given to increase the buses to the area.

Bridge:

Objection to location of the new canal bridge [at northern end], serious conflict with the mix of uses envisaged for the square, should be located at the foot of Great Clarendon Street.

The position of the bridge should be moved to the south of the site, nearer the end of Great Clarendon Street.

Problem of access to community centre, bridge should be located at the foot of Great Clarendon Street.

Support for the revised plans, particularly the relocation of the canal bridge. Aligning it with Great Clarendon St was the City Council's original intention and was also advocated by the Canals and Rivers Trust and the Oxford Civic Society and with good reason. It is good planning to segregate the main cycle route from north Oxford to the train station from this new square and it is nonsense to insist the square will lose vitality. It will have a community centre serving morning coffee and lunches during the day as well as a restaurant and boaters using the boatyard and this will provide sufficient activity, and be all the safer without having the conflict of this main cycle route crossing it.

Low level bridge directly into piazza has support amount local organisations however some disadvantages including, piazza should be a quiet community space, not a thoroughfare for new Radcliffe Infirmary University quarter, low bridge impedes boat traffic which is potentially increased by new boatyard, amount of time bridge is up for may cause nuisance to locals and pedestrians (solution of high bridge at end of Great Clarendon St.) construction of development should be phased to take into account the needs of the boaters as college cruisers is depended on by canal users, increased cost of community centre threatens viability.

Swing bridge is a terrible idea it will cause congestion on the towpath as well as on the canal. Increased pedestrian traffic is likely to causes towpath jams when bridge is open. Cycling will be in the way when people are in the square or when there are public events. Bridge should be opposite Great Clarendon Street and it should a high bridge.

Level bridge is an excellent idea.

Conflict between rushing cyclist to stations in same space ad children going to proposed nursery.

Would be better to have a traditional fixed arch bridge

Bridge is welcomed and considered essential that it leads directly into the public square

Public Square/ Restaurant

Support for siting of square, community centre and boatyard

Plan does not include which party will maintain control over the square and its uses, or the supply of street furniture and who will pay for the upkeep of the square.

Lack of specific management arrangements is a concern, may create unsocial behaviour.

Noise control should be a priority, car traffic should be discouraged.

Restaurant will take up space which is already at a premium, adds nothing to area, creates extra traffic, idea of piazza is that it is a space for the local community, not another commercial site, developers would maintain ownership of the restaurant and therefore control of rent (this has failed at Oxford Castle quarter), also height issue with the block that contains the affordable housing.

Other good restaurants are already in the area (Canal Street and Cranham Street)
The space could be better used to lower the overall height of the building.

Jericho does not need another restaurant

Other:

Every possible opportunity should be taken to add new trees.

New buildings should not be too tall, and should respect the existing architectural style.

Effect of the development on Great Clarendon St west of the junction with St Barnabas Street.

Insufficient information for a conservation area consent which affects setting of grade 1 listed building.

Council should set conditions as to building materials used.

Absence of biodiversity measures.

This page is intentionally left blank