

Appendix E

Summary of Responses 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to maintain employment sites in Oxford. Suggested addition.
David Colbeck	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Council applied for 'exemption' to Gvt for this list

owner of BroadfieldHouse, Between Towns Rd		<p>of sites but were not successful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 HarkerTait	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given shortage of housing empty offices should be converted to residential
Jan Bartlett	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More housing needed in Oxford
Jason Arneil	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City badly needs housing should leave it to market demand to determine use.
Cllr. Tony Brett	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmed no comments to make
Martin Small (English Heritage)	Don't know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment since unlikely to impact on Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments.

This page is intentionally left blank