**Appendix E**

**Summary of Reponses to Consultation on Article 4 Direction (offices to residential)**

This consultation ran from 28th March to 23rd May 2014 and there were a total of 32 responses:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Number**  |
| Support | 15 |
| Object | 14 |
| Other | 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent** | **Nature of response** (object, support or comment) | **Brief summary of response** |
| John Sear | Support | * Need to maintain employment sites in Oxford. Suggested addition.
 |
| David Colbeck | Support | * But any future planning application should be approved unless clearly shown that loss of office space will result in loss of employment; or residential use sub-standard
 |
| Anthony Beechers | Support | * Supports Article 4 but wishes to ensure position is monitored in the future
 |
| 12 people | Support | No comments |
| Agent: JPPC acting for LCH Properties Ltd (owner of Summertown Pavilion) | Object | * This property is an aged and outdate office premises
* List of Protected Employment sites, subject to the Article 4 Direction are not all office uses and is therefore an ‘indiscriminate’ list
* City Council applied for ‘exemption’ to Gvt for this list of sites but were not successful
* Consider the loss of employment sites is not a ‘worrying trend’ and that no exceptional case has been made
* Seeks to impose a ‘blanket order’
 |
| Agent: Kemp and Kemp on behalf of S. Hutchins & Green (owners of 1A Southmoor Rd)  | Object | * The City Council sought an ‘exemption’ to the introduction of this Order but were unsuccessful
* There is no material change in circumstances to justify a different decision
* Does not consider that there is sufficient evidence to show that the loss of employment sites would impact on local economic growth
* Considered there is an over-supply of offices and therefore more employment land than the market requires
* The effect on the Article 4 Direction would be to reduce the potential amount of housing that could contribute to Oxford’s significant housing need
* This site is not considered to be worthy of protection for its existing use but would be better suited for residential
 |
| Thomas Homes owner of Broadfield House, Between Towns Rd | Object | * City Council applied for ‘exemption’ to Gvt for this list of sites but were not successful
* The list comprises sites other than those in use as offices
* Broadfield House already has ‘prior approval’ for residential and conversion work is under-construction
* Consider Class J relaxation is re-using outdated offices and supporting provision of housing in Oxford
* City Council seeks to impose a ‘blanket order’ and failed to justify the case for an Article 4 Direction
 |
| Oxfordshire County Council | Object | * Provision of employment sites should be balanced against need to identify additional housing sites
* Consider that some employment sites could be released for housing without undermining future economic growth
* Consider that as part of SHMA review all protected sites should be assessed for their suitability for residential development
 |
| South Oxfordshire District Council | Object | * Does not consider that a case has been made to justify an Article 4 Direction. No evidence of impact on local amenity or wellbeing.
* In the context of housing targets in the SHMA, consider Oxford’s Core Strategy is need of review together with list of protected employment sites
* Some of these employment sites should be reviewed for release to housing to meet SHMA targets and help Oxford’s housing needs.
 |
| Cherwell District Council | Object | * Would like some assurance that implications of the Article 4 Direction will be reflected in the post Oxfordshire SHMA process have been fully taken into account
* Request confirmation that the Article 4 Direction will not restrict housing capacity assessment, which should be free of policy constraints.
 |
| Vale of White Horse | Object | * Does not consider that a case has been made to justify an Article 4 Direction. No evidence of impact on local amenity or wellbeing.
* In the context of housing targets in the SHMA, consider Oxford’s Core Strategy is need of review together with list of protected employment sites
* Some of these employment sites should be reviewed for release to housing to meet SHMA targets and help Oxford’s housing needs.
 |
| Michael Harker Tait  | Object | * Green Street Bindery should be allowed to convert to residential. Employment uses generate traffic and cause problems for residents. Need more affordable housing
 |
| Miss. Joyce Ann Day  | Object | * Given shortage of housing empty offices should be converted to residential
 |
| Jan Bartlett | Object | * More housing needed in Oxford
 |
| Jason Arneil | Object | * City badly needs housing should leave it to market demand to determine use.
 |
| Cllr. Tony Brett | Object | * Oxford short of affordable housing and therefore should allow B1 offices to be converted to residential use. Object to proposed Article 4 Direction
 |
| 2 people | Object | No comments |
| The Theatres Trust | Comment | * From experience real risks occur to the operation of cultural facilities from residential development being located next to them
* Residential uses require high standards of amenity for theatres to meet, such as around noise and disturbance
 |
| Natural England | No objection | * Confirmed no comments to make
 |
| Martin Small (English Heritage) | Don’t know | * No comment since unlikely to impact on Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments.
 |