**Comments made on the University of Oxford voluntary Environmental Statement**

Only those suggesting clarification, further information or a shortcoming to the ES.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Summary of comment received | Commentary | City Council to seeking action by the University |
| Oxford Architectural and Historical Society | ES under-estimates the substantial and cumulative harm the development has caused to important heritage – Port Meadow and other heritage assets | Opinion not flaw in ES |  |
| Oxford Architectural and Historical Society | Assessment only on Spring and summer - No consideration of visibility of development in other seasons | EH said same thing | The City Council requests the assessment should include Winter |
| Oxford Architectural and Historical Society | The residual substantial harm is neither ‘ clearly; nor ‘convincingly’ outweighed by any public benefit | Opinion not flaw in ES |  |
| Mike Gilbert Planning for the Save Port Meadow Group | ES omits a considerable amount of socio-economic information | This has some relevance | The City Council request that a response is made to this point |
| Mike Gilbert Planning for the Save Port Meadow Group | Insufficient weight given to the development’s high adverse impact on the four heritage assets of national significance | Opinion not flaw in ES |  |
| Dominic Woodfield Bio scan | Not compliant with EIA regs – consideration of alternatives artificially restricted. Not assessed the potential for demolishing the current development | Clarification would seem sensible | The City Council request that a response is made to this point |
| *English Heritage – David Brock* | *Port meadow is an ‘undesignated heritage asset’ – the effect is ‘high adverse’*  *The skyline is not an asset so much as a view . The skyline in general is not affected*  *sceptical of the judgement which ES arrives at* | Observation by author not flaw in ES |  |
| English Heritage – David Brock | Chapter 8 does not engage with whether ‘high adverse’ effect equates to ‘substantial harm’ in terms of NPPF. - I recommend clarification | Clarification seems sensible | The City Council request that a response is made to this point |
| English Heritage – David Brock | To supply winter photographs | This is relevant | The City Council requests the assessment should include Winter |
| Freemen of Oxford | Real shortcoming of ES estimates of the financial costs. Not set against economic costs the costs borne by that sector of society that relies on Port Meadow for enjoyment, relaxation, exercise and quest for temporary escape | Opinion not flaw in ES |  |