**Summary of Comments received**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent** | **Summary of Comment** |
| **Objections to the area- suggestions for extra inclusions** |
| Cllr Katharine Harborne 5 local residents | Several respondents suggested the triangular area of land to the north of Old Road and close to the ring-road (that includes the Stansfeld educational centre, Douglas Downes Close, Dorchester Close and Stansfield Close) should be included in the neighbourhood area. Stansfeld Outdoor Education Centre is up for sale by Brimingham City Council and residents are concerned about the site being sold off to property developers.  They feel that including it in the plan will ensure that residents have much more of a say on what developments are permitted here if the land is sold off. One respondent said they feel the area seems part of the historic Headington Quarry area and is unified with the rest of Headington by Quarry Road.  |
| 2 local residents | A few respondents were concerned that Wood Farm, or part of Wood Farm, is excluded from the neighbourhood area. The respondents believe Wood Farm to be part of Headington. They had heard different things about whether the existence of a regeneration area designation for Wood Farm would conflict with a neighbourhood plan and therefore was a reason to exclude the area.  |
| Local resident | One respondent noted that the part of Old Headington Conservation area close to the boundary with Northway is not included in the proposed neighbourhood area. There was concern this could cause admin issues in the future.  Another respondent largely in support of the plan wondered whether Dunstan Park could be included in the boundary.  |
| Local resident | This respondent appreciates the difficulty of defining the area, but feels there are areas missed out and also areas included that shouldn’t be included. The respondent notes that the first part of  Risinghurst built in the thirties is near to Quarry and also considers that Wood Farm and the old hamlet of Titup seem to be part of Headington.  However, the respondent also considers the area beyond Osler Road bordered by the London and the Marston Road to be in Marston, partly because this is the catchment area for schools in Marston.    |
| **Objection to the area- area too large/ includes more than one community** |
| Ella Derow | A neighbourhood is much smaller than the boundaries that have been artificially developed. Many of my local concerns are different from & sometimes antithetical to the opinions & the needs of residents and institutions in different  parts of this space. As I understand it, many vested interests in any way bearing the slightest association with the name 'Headington' pressed for inclusion in the proposed area. A committee-developed spatial elephant has been put forward as a neighbourhood.  |
| **Support for the proposed area**  |
| Oxford Brookes University Estates and Facilities Management; Cllr Roz Smith, 5 local residents, Friends of Old Headington, Highfield Residents’ Association, Headington Action.  | Several respondents were supportive of the proposed area. One specific reason for support included the inclusion of the Lye Valley North Fen area (rather than using the brook as a boundary and splitting the site). Another was that the proposed area reflected a community of residents and businesses who have worked well together in the past. It was acknowledged that complete agreement on the boundaries would be difficult to obtain, but thought that a good solution has been found. One respondent agreed that all the hospitals and Oxford Brookes needed to be included, meaning that the area would have to be large. The feeling was also expressed that the opportunity for residents to have a say in future development is needed. Headington Action and Highfield Residents’ Association both stated that they approve of the area including major institutions and local amenities and they feel it will provide a platform from which to strengthen Headintgon’s identity.  |
| **Other/general comments** |
| Highways Agency; The Coal Authority; Oxfordshire County Council; Natural England; English Heritage | All these consultees responded to confirm that they had reviewed the consultation but do not have any comments to make at this stage.  |
| Local resident | Request for information about whether certain streets are included or excluded from the plan, as they found the map too faint to read.  |
| local resident (part of a larger comment summarised elsewhere in the table) | The respondent agrees that all of the groups listed have an interest in Headington's development, including the Universities and hospitals. They felt that elected local city and county councillors to represent local residents and should make decisions on their behalf. The university and the hospitals do employ many local people and provide many benefits to the area but the respondent feels many people’s views towards them are ambiguous because of the extra traffic, demands on local housing and parking problems that they bring to the area. |