

Appendix 2

Consultation Summary Report for North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area Appraisal

Summary

This report provides a summary of consultation undertaken by Oxford City Council between 6th March and 28th April 2017 on a draft conservation area appraisal for North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area (NOVSCA). The conservation area appraisal seeks to define and record the special character and interest of the area to help inform how the area is managed in the future. In particular, designation as a conservation area helps to protect the historic environment and the appraisal will provide guidance for developers and residents, and for the council, to help inform future development in the conservation area. The consultation sought the views of local residents, institutions within the conservation area, and special interest groups. Copies of the draft appraisal were made available electronically on the council's website and in hard copy from councillors. We encouraged consultees to provide feedback on the appraisal by completing a questionnaire online or sending written responses by email or post. A total of 57 organisations and individuals responded to the consultation. A range of ideas, views and concerns were identified from the consultation responses received. These included the following comments:

Theme	Comments Received
Format, structure, scope and presentation of the appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appraisal is comprehensive and readable• More in depth analysis is required• Insufficient graphic presentation• Consider captions for images• Fewer character areas would eliminate repetition
Balancing of differing needs of institutional and residential use	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Institutional use makes a positive contribution; predates designation of conservation area; and has saved buildings under threat• Institutional use is a threat to the character of the conservation area• Appraisal is biased against institutional use• Need for greater understanding of the diversity of the area• HMO use has extended the life of buildings
Features that appraisal should include in management proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Article 4 Directions should be used to remove permitted development rights• Attention to materials; textures• Boundary treatments; high walls; more detail needed in section on railings; automatic gates are not in keeping with character• Replacement windows (inc. skylights) and doors• Solar panels; aerials and satellite dishes• Excessive lighting; light pollution• Excessive cleaning; treatment of stonework and brickwork; inappropriate mortars• Garages

Aspects of 'institutionalisation' that need to be managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatories • Fire escapes • Signage • Parking
Consultation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to engage institutions • Engage with stakeholders using the Character Assessment Toolkit
Listed buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Range of suggestions for additional buildings for which listed status should be sought • Concerns that listing will inhibit future development • Consider expanding the Oxford Heritage Asset Register
Modifications to boundaries of the conservation area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The boundaries should not change • Agreement and disagreement with proposed inclusion of Bainton and Moreton Roads; Walton Manor Conservation Area; Radcliffe Observatory • University Parks should be included in the conservation area • Maps required to clarify proposals
Inappropriate development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of what constitutes inappropriate development not clear • Examples of development perceived to be inappropriate
Importance of gardens in the conservation area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater clarity required on gardens and garden buildings, sheds and storage facilities • Treatment of front gardens: parking, hard standing, surfaces • Extensions in back gardens threaten the character of the conservation area
Aspects of the character of the conservation that should be addressed/included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birdsong • Green Templeton College • Light pollution • Materials of new buildings • Stables, coach houses, back lanes • Insufficient attention to buildings of 1960s onwards

The council has used information gained from the consultation to make amendments to the conservation area appraisal where appropriate. These include:

- Additional background information on unlisted buildings, and guidance on other types of protection for buildings of interest
- More nuanced graphics and text on the boundaries of character areas within the conservation area
- More detailed examples of threats and vulnerabilities to the character of the conservation area
- Clarification of the distinction between the public and private realms
- Greater balance in presenting the differing interests of institutions, groups and residents within the conservation area
- Additional maps
- More detailed examples of features that contribute to the character of the conservation area

- Clarification of wording, correction of typographical errors and errors of fact

Council officers have reviewed feedback from the consultation and made responses throughout this report. We expect the conservation area appraisal to be adopted in October 2017.

The purpose of undertaking public consultation

The draft conservation area appraisal was published in draft by Oxford City Council in March 2017 for comment.

North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area was designated between 1968 and 1976. Guidance from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and Historic England recommends that designated conservation areas should undergo a formal character appraisal to justify their original designation, to define their significance and values, and to inform decisions regarding future change.

The NOVSCA Appraisal seeks to define and record the special character and interest of the area to help inform how the area is managed in the future. In particular, designation as a conservation area helps to protect the historic environment and the appraisal is used by the council to help make decisions about alterations, development and demolition.

One of the main principles of the planning system is that local communities and stakeholders should be involved from the outset in the preparation of planning policy documents. The early work on the conservation area appraisal involved meetings with key stakeholders, including both institutions based in the area as well as recognised residents groups, and public meetings. This early work fed into the work undertaken to produce the consultation draft.

This consultation statement sets out how Oxford City Council undertook consultation on the draft conservation area appraisal for North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area. The consultation was carried out in accordance with the commitments in Oxford City Council's Statement of Community Involvement in Planning, which sets out how we will involve the community in the planning process.

Consultation methodology

The council published the draft conservation area appraisal on its website on 6th March 2017. Hard copies were distributed to the city councillors of wards within the conservation area. The consultation aimed to involve local residents, institutions, stakeholders and interest groups. We sought to draw this to the attention of residents using press releases and a residents meeting; dedicated correspondence was sent to interest groups and the colleges of the University of Oxford, and other institutions, that fall within the conservation area.

To prompt structured feedback on the guide, we asked people to consider the following questions:

1. The appraisal suggests that there are significant buildings within the conservation area which would be worthy of being added to the statutory list. Are there any buildings which you think merit being listed?
2. The appraisal recommends reviewing the boundary of the conservation area. Do you agree with the suggested modifications to the boundary?
3. The appraisal identifies inappropriate development of buildings within the conservation area. Which of these do you think pose a particular threat to the character of the area? Are there any other types of development you see as a threat?
4. The appraisal also identifies improvements that could be made to the conservation area. Which of these do you think are a particular priority? Are there any other aspects that could be improved?
5. Do you have any other comments or feedback on the appraisal?

Responses to these questions could be sent to us via our online consultation portal. Written responses could also be submitted via email or post. The consultation ran from 6th April – 28th March 2017, allowing 8 weeks for responses to the consultation.

Consultation Responses

Oxford City Council received 57 responses to the consultation. 16 of these were from organisations and 41 of these were from individuals.

Responses shown in this section are presented anonymously except those which were made on behalf of one of the following groups or organisations:

Green Templeton College
Hertford College
Historic England
Kellogg College
Lady Margaret Hall
Linton Road Neighbourhood Association (LRNA)
Norham Manor Residents' Association (NMRA)
Oxford Architectural History Society (OAHS)
Oxford Preservation Trust (OPT)
Park Town Trust
St Antony's College
St Hugh's College
University College
University of Oxford
Wolfson College
Wycliffe Hall

Q1. The appraisal suggests that there are significant buildings within the conservation area which would be worthy of being added to the statutory list. Are there any buildings which you think merit being listed?

Comment	Number	Outcome
Items in Appendix C en bloc	2 (NMRA)	<p>Further background information has been added to the list of unlisted buildings, noting that buildings included on the list are deserving of further consideration either nationally or locally.</p> <p>The Oxford Heritage Asset Register is designed to recognise and protect buildings outside statutory listing. Members of the public can nominate buildings for listing on the Oxford Heritage Asset Register.</p> <p>The Council could consider encouraging local participation in the Historic England initiative 'Enriching the List' so that more information is publicly available about listed buildings in the conservation area.</p>
Specific items in Appendix C		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherwell Boathouse • St Margaret's Institute 	<p>2</p> <p>1</p>	
Items not in Appendix C: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wharf building at 1a Southmoor Road • Any public house • Few in Norham Manor RA incl. Fyfield Rd • Older conservatories and industrial buildings • Moreton Rd and other nearby houses • Benson Place in Norham Manor 	6	
List of EH/HE tentative recommendations/Oxford list a disgrace	2 (NMRA)	
Concerns that listing will inhibit future development	2 (Wycliffe, Hertford)	
Listing may be helpful to maintain and protect character	2	
Consider expanding the Oxford Heritage Assets Register	1 (OPT)	
Inappropriate question	4 (St Antony's, Green Templeton, University, St Hugh's)	
Add Lane House North to list of significant non-listed buildings	1	

Q2. The appraisal recommends reviewing the boundary of the conservation area. Do you agree with the suggested modifications to the boundary?			
Comment	Number	Outcome	
No change	1	<p>A varied range of responses on the subject of changes to the boundaries of the conservation area suggests that there is no firm consensus. At this stage it has been decided that the boundaries will remain unchanged, Walton Manor Conservation Area and the Central Conservation Area will be appraised in the future.</p> <p>Additional maps have been added to the final appraisal to make the boundaries of character areas clearer, and to provide more detailed information about the listed buildings within the character areas. The appraisal has also been amended to reflect suggestions about the boundaries of certain character areas so that the text and graphics can be more nuanced.</p> <p>It is noted that several respondents commented on the absence of the University Parks from inclusion in the conservation area. The University Parks fall within the Central Conservation Area, but references to the University Parks within the appraisal recognise their importance to the setting and character of the area. Likewise, Somerville College falls within the Central Conservation Area.</p>	
Bainton & Moreton Roads	3 (NMRA) 12 (LMH, LRNA) 1 3		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either/or • Yes, include in NOVS • Combine with Staverton and Lathbury Roads to create a separate conservation area • No, don't include in NOVS 			
Walton Manor Conservation Area			10 (LMH, LRNA) 5 (NMRA)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, include in NOVS • No, don't include in NOVS 			
Radcliffe Observatory and lower tip of current conservation area	10 (LMH, NMRA) 4 (St Anthony's)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, move into Central Conservation Area • No, don't remove; impact of removing the Observatory on estate management 			
Consider re-drawing boundary of the two following <u>character</u> areas: Lathbury & Staverton Roads and St Margaret's	1		
Consider including Dragon Lane in Park Town character area	1		
Absence of University Parks from CA is a weakness	3 (NMRA)		
Absence of Somerville College	1		
Absence of graphic maps to clarify the arguments	6 (Wycliffe, St Antony's, Green Templeton, University, St Hugh's, HE)		
Ferocity not the best word to describe the objections to the proposed new Pitt-Rivers Museum	1		
Change name from NOVSCA to North Oxford Conservation Area	2 (LRNA)		
Third of the area as a whole not assigned to a character area (Warnborough, Tackley Place, Farndon, Dragon)	1		

Q3. The appraisal identifies inappropriate development of buildings within the conservation area. Which of these do you think pose a particular threat to the character of the area? Are there any other types of development you see as a threat?		
Comment	Number	Outcome
General observations		Responses to this question demonstrate that there are a range of differing interests and priorities amongst respondents. Some responses suggest a tension between the needs and interests of institutional uses and those of residents. Whilst some comments suggest that institutions within the conservation area have a negative impact on character, others recognise the important role the institutions have played, and continue to play, in shaping the character of the area, and that institutional use has saved some buildings that may otherwise have been lost. It is noted that there are suggestions that the draft appraisal was biased against institutional use; the final appraisal attempts to present a more balanced account of the differing uses and interests within the conservation area.
New build/multi-occupancy	2	
• Unkind development for capital gain	4	
• No need to single out any one. See SI 596 in force since 15 Apr 15	1	
• Appraisal identifies appropriately and examples are fairly all-encompassing	1	
• Rural feel of Dragon Lane and importance of trees within Park Town	3 (OPT)	
• A leading question designed to reinforce the negatives	2 (University, St Hugh's)	
• Treatment by university of former residential housing	1 (OAHS)	
• Inappropriate mortars	1	
Examples of inappropriate development		
• Former YWCA, Jesus College flats, apartment complexes, proposed redevelopment of Aristotle House	1	
• New development overlooking Port Meadow	1	
• Blocks of retirement flats	1	
Boundary treatments		
• High walls	3 (NMRA)	
• Beef up section on railings and ensure not applied where not previously used as in the Arts and Crafts streets	5 (LRNA, OPT)	
• Muddled	1 (Kellogg)	
Front gardens		Amendments to the appraisal reflect the issues raised relating to threats to the character of the conservation area, and reference is made to the aspects that contribute to character, such as boundary treatments, mortar, etc. in the added section on Negative Features, Vulnerabilities and Opportunities for enhancement. Detail has also been added on what some perceive to be the negative features resulting from the
• Greater clarity on gardens, garden buildings needed generally	1 (OPT)	
• Hard standing and/or car parking	6 (LRNA, OAHS)	
• Sheds and storage facilities	5 (NMRA)	
• Automatic gates militating against character	3	
• Do not conflate tarmac and gravel as latter linked to sustainable drainage and thinness of the topsoil layer	1	
Replacement windows and doors	4 (LRNA,OAHS)	
Solar panels	5 (LRNA, OAHS)	
Sky lights/conservation rooflights	5 (OAHS)	

Q3. The appraisal identifies inappropriate development of buildings within the conservation area. Which of these do you think pose a particular threat to the character of the area? Are there any other types of development you see as a threat?		
Comment	Number	Outcome
Painting stone and brickwork	2	institutional use of buildings such as fire escapes, signage and parking.
Excessive cleaning		
Excessive lighting		Comments relating to the housing market are noted, but it is not within the scope of the appraisal to influence the condition of the market.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally Institutional 	2 2 (NMRA)	
Other types of development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aerials and satellite dishes Creation of basements, or so-called “iceberg homes” (see <i>The Telegraph</i> 28 June 2017) Dropping of litter Conservatories Garages Rear boundary walls 	2 3 (OAHS) 1 2 (OAHS) 1 1 (OAHS)	The greater clarity and detail on vulnerabilities of the conservation area highlights the importance of features noted in this section, and will increase awareness of their role in forming the character of the area. Their inclusion in the appraisal will provide an important record of their significance, and could form the basis of a future management plan should the Council wish to pursue this, following completion of their programme of appraising the conservation areas within the city.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wrong types of development put forward 	1 (LMH)	
Development: backland, back garden, extensions on backs or sides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comments with recommendations Make clear that if backland development is not harmful to the significance of the CA, it should be encouraged Extensions in back gardens threaten Arcadian feel Extensions: end of terrace and/or blocking gaps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Points in Appraisal are well made Point could be made more strongly Side extensions vs. back garden developments 	2 (LRNA) 3 (Hertford, Wolfson) 8 (NMRA, LRNA) 6 1 (NMRA) 1	Some responses suggested that the appraisal lacked clarity on the distinction between public and private realms. The appraisal has been amended to clarify this distinction.
Institutionalisation Institutional use pre-dates creation of the CA or has saved buildings otherwise under threat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points in Appraisal are well made Fire escapes, signage, parking spaces Institutional encroachment Threat to character of area Defence of positive contribution that University and Colleges make to the conservation area 	4 (Wycliffe, University, UColl, St Hugh’s) 1 1 3 (NMRA) 1 6 (St Anthony’s, Green Templeton, University, Kellogg, Hertford, Wolfson)	Some comments relate to a need for clearer guidance on development in gardens and between buildings. The role and importance of gardens and the gaps between buildings has been clarified. Additionally, the emerging Local Plan 2036 contains preferred policy options for development in back gardens, and for extensions to existing buildings. These policies will be supported by the content of the appraisal.
		On institutionalisation, see response to question 3 above.

Q3. The appraisal identifies inappropriate development of buildings within the conservation area. Which of these do you think pose a particular threat to the character of the area? Are there any other types of development you see as a threat?

Comment	Number	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defence of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) extending life of listed and non-listed buildings • Not all institutional uses have been positive but balance needed 	<p>1 (Hertford)</p> <p>1 (Hertford)</p>	<p>All planning applications follow the government's policy contained within the NPPF and the NPPGs. The appraisal is a supporting document to help make planning decisions against these policies.</p>
<p>Use of planning conditions to leverage public benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document needs better to consider the guidance in the NPPF • In favour • Against use • Absence of the Parks as a benefit 	<p>3 (University, UColl, St Hugh's)</p> <p>1</p> <p>1 (University)</p> <p>1</p>	

Q4. The appraisal also identifies improvements that could be made to the conservation area. Which of these do you think are a particular priority? Are there any other aspects that could be improved?

Comment	Number	Outcome
Roads and pavement surfaces	10 (LMH)	As is the case with some of the responses to question 4, some responses suggest the draft appraisal lacked clarity in distinguishing between the public and private realms. As noted above, the final appraisal has been amended to provide greater clarity.
Stone kerbs and setts	5 (LRNA)	
Street furniture		
• Street light fittings	2	
• Public seating	5	
• Less furniture as takes up parking spaces	1	
• Cleaning up road names	1	Comments on aspects of the conservation area that could be improved are noted and added to the appraisal where appropriate (see Negative Features, Vulnerabilities and Opportunities; relevant character areas), although not all features are within the scope of the conservation area appraisal (e.g. control of skips). As described above, this detail will provide an important record that will help to inform proposals for and decisions about development in the conservation area.
• More sensitive street signage	1	
Traffic/Staverton and Lathbury Rds less busy than St Margaret's	9 (Green Templeton, University, St Hugh's)	
Other enhancements:		
• Restrict coach parking/parking in general	5 (LRNA, OAHS)	
• Control of skips during building works/Contractors' vehicles	2 (OAHS)	
• Graffiti removal	1	
• Noise	1	
• Sustainable urban drainage	3	
• Colour of metalwork: is grey green being promoted as a policy?	1 (Kellogg)	
		Comments regarding biodiversity and tree management are noted. Following discussions with Council tree officers the appraisal has been amended to provide greater clarity.

Question/Theme	Number	Outcome
Comments overlapping Q3		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erosion of character through side and other extensions Decorative style of Kingston Rd houses Front garden/boundary treatments advice Bin storage and cycle sheds Remove permitted development rights through Article 4 directions – boundaries, parking needs, windows and doors, masonry, exterior lighting Use appropriate materials e.g. for replacement windows, for extensions Pull together statements on views between buildings 	<p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>10 (Green Templeton, LRNA)</p> <p>2 (Green Templeton)</p> <p>4 (NMRA)</p> <p>1</p> <p>1 (Kellogg)</p>	See comments on question 3 above.
Tree protection, management and planting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General/borrowed landscape in institutional grounds Statements could be enhanced Public domain, don't fetter private domain When tree removal necessary, replace like for like where feasible 	<p>10 (NMRA, University, St Hugh's, OAHS)</p> <p>4 (Hertford/LRNA/OPT/HE)</p> <p>1 (Wolfson)</p> <p>1</p>	
Failure to define appropriate/inappropriate	1 (Wycliffe)	
Failure to address positive contribution of new development	3 (St Antony's, Green Templeton)	
Accessibility of Port Meadow is a benefit, also views	1	
Insufficient graphic presentation	1 (St Antony's)	
Restrict spread of language schools	1	
Development management proposals are sensible	1	

Q5. Do you have any other comments or feedback on the appraisal?		
Comment	Number	Outcome
Appraisal welcomed/comprehensive/readable	12	Comments on the quality of the appraisal are noted.
Appraisal unfit for purpose	3 (Green Templeton, Wolfson, LMH)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One-sided view Institutions need to grow and expand More prominence needed on encroachment of space Good management need not be precious Too much concern with fronts and not enough with backs Omission of obvious threats Repetitiveness Thin Look at area as a whole not as sum of its parts Listing responsibility of Historic England/DCMS Insufficient positives about significant non-listed buildings Comes across as being anti-institutional use Consider as an early draft as basis for more work and a management plan Failure to address healthy urban living areas, which will be dense and thrive (contrasts quiet of Charlbury Rd with buzz of Winchester Rd) 	2 (LMH, Wolfson) 3 (Wycliffe, University, Kellogg) 1 1 2 (OAHs) 1 (NMRA) 1 1 1 (University) 2 (University, St Hugh's) 1 (University) 2 (U Coll, Wolfson) 1 (OPT) 1	This appraisal builds on previous work during which public meetings were held with different groups of stakeholders. A public consultation was carried out on the draft appraisal, the details of which can be found in the introduction to this document. There were two public meetings, one on 3 October 2016 during the fieldwork period and the other on 23 March 2017 during OCC's consultation period. This appraisal follows the well-established Oxford Character Assessment Toolkit for fieldwork, and, based on past experience, follows the guidance set out in the <i>Conservation Principles</i> published by English Heritage (now Historic England) in 2008.
Comments on process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to engage institutions Local meetings with films Need to engage with all stakeholders using the proven Toolkit Desire to work with OCC more directly and constructively 	9 (LMH, Wycliffe, St Antony's, Green Templeton, University, Kellogg, St Hugh's, Wolfson, LMH) 1 1 (OPT) 1 (LMH)	
Comments on presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of graphical presentation across all sections of the document 	4 (University, St Hugh's, Wolfson, OPT)	Comments on presentation are noted. The document has been written to be an effective working tool to guide decision-making about

Q5. Do you have any other comments or feedback on the appraisal?		
Comment	Number	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefit of captions Benefit of copy-editing Benefit of a stronger conclusion Clarify information about the new buildings at St Hugh's Bardwell Estate references Kent rather than Lake District Pejorative language/biases/omissions Balance needed: highlighting so many negatives needs to be balanced with positive ideas for going forward Inadequate spatial analysis Checklist of issues for officers to refer to Blue plaques an irrelevance Either fewer character areas to eliminate repetition or deeper analysis Application of Conservation Principles actually unhelpful; architectural and historical interest more useful Presentation of information about locally significant buildings needs to be sharpened 	<p>4 (Wolfson, OPT) 1 2 1 1 5 (University, Kellogg, Hertford, St Hugh's, Wolfson) 1 (University) 2 (University, St Hugh's) 1 1 1 (HE) 1 (HE) 1 (HE)</p>	<p>planning applications within the conservation area. The final document has been designed and presented in such a way to improve clarity and useability. The following maps have been added to the appraisal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation Area Boundary Historic Maps (showing boundary) dated 1898, 1919 and 1938 Age of Buildings Survey 1948 Views and Vistas Character Areas Detailed maps of each character area showing listed buildings, positive buildings and tree preservation orders)
Need Article 4 directions (for some this means urgently)	10 (LRNA, HE)	See responses to question 3 above.
<p>Suggestions for inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birdsong School traffic issues (e.g. Dragon) More on light pollution particularly from institutional buildings University Parks Water meadows east of the Cherwell Include Kellogg College (p.19-21) Include Green Templeton (p.19-21) Include schools and private tutorial colleges New buildings at St Anne's (p.20) and LMH (very new lodges by J Simpson p.19) Information about the textures provided by different brick bonds 	<p>1 1 1 1 (NMRA) 1 (NMRA) 5 (Kellogg, Wolfson, OPT) 3 (Kellogg, Wolfson, OPT) 1 (OPT) 3 (LMH) 1 (Kellogg)</p>	<p>Suggestions for inclusion are noted and, where appropriate, have been added to the appraisal so that it will be an effective working tool to guide decision-making about planning applications within the conservation area. (See also comments above on changes to the boundaries of the conservation area, and those features that are included in other conservation areas).</p>

Q5. Do you have any other comments or feedback on the appraisal?		
Comment	Number	Outcome
<p>(p.23); slate types (p.24); windows should be added to building styles, materials and colours (p.23)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials of new buildings including stainless steel, pre-cast concrete, stone • Role of other colleges which do not have administrative hub in the CA but which own property • Greater understanding of the diversity of the area • Effect of cessation of 99-year leases in 1960s • 30 'proposals' from the previous unadopted draft appraisal which should be mentioned. • Staverton • Oxford Design Review Panel: role • Density of new institutional development • Stables, coach houses, back lanes which add to the character • Obvious threats: expansion of educational establishments, traffic, Northern Gateway development 	<p>1 (Hertford)</p> <p>1 (U Coll)</p> <p>1 (U Coll)</p> <p>1</p> <p>2 (OAHs)</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1 (OAHs)</p> <p>1 (OPT)</p> <p>1</p>	
<p>Additional comments on institutionalisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tone might preclude successful management of University/College estate management in medium-long term • Request to remove bullet point regarding institutional development south of Staverton Road 	<p>1 (Hertford)</p> <p>1 (UColl)</p>	See responses to question 3 above.
<p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success of solar PV integrated roof systems, so retrograde to insist on planning permission • Stop developers buying up pubs • Bainton, Lathbury, Moreton and Staverton Roads should not be included • Park Town 'punished' due to parking needs • Extension at St Andrew's church is anything but discreet; NB. Designed by Maguire and Murray and completed 1988 • Effect of recommendations on those who live there; must not become "a 	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p>	These comments have been reviewed and are noted. Where appropriate, they have been added to the appraisal so that it will be an effective working tool to guide decision-making about planning applications within the conservation area.

Q5. Do you have any other comments or feedback on the appraisal?

Comment	Number	Outcome
<p>deserted museum for occasional occupancy by international billionaires". OCC needs more sensitive, affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance in presentation of rural Park Town (p.12) and homogeneity (p.5 Summary); also, Norham Manor in relation to Kingston Road (p.13); also battle of the styles (p.23) • Roads are not laid out as a formal grid of streets, particularly St Margaret's • Inconsistency about views (p.15 and p.16); enhancement provided by modern buildings viewed between older buildings • Brutalism is not a term covering all C20 architecture in the CA • Listing of 21st century buildings • Inconsistencies in the discussion of the character areas; Kingston Road area needs to be drawn out better • Are there no positives in Banbury Road? • Insufficient attention to buildings of 1960s onwards; positive contribution of C20 architecture to texture and character of CA/record the developments of the past 50 years and assess impact both positive and negative • Conservation Area not a Restoration Area • University applications should be dealt with greater rigour than private applications • Cycle lane provision/Staverton Rd cycle route • Encourage diversity with HMOs • Needs to be a tool for effectively managing change in an area where it will happen • Value of Oxford Views Study • Foreword by respected historian • How will planners use the recommendations if no Article 4 directions adopted • Report commended for analysis of relationships between physical fabric and patterns of use, but absence 	<p>2 (Kellogg, Wolfson)</p> <p>1 (Kellogg)</p> <p>1 (Kellogg)</p> <p>2 (Kellogg, Hertford)</p> <p>1 (Kellogg)</p> <p>1 (Kellogg)</p> <p>1 (Kellogg)</p> <p>6 (Hertford, U Coll, Wolfson, LRNA, OPT, HE)</p> <p>3 (Kellogg, Wolfson, OPT)</p> <p>1</p> <p>2 (LRNA)</p> <p>1 (OAHS)</p> <p>1 (OPT)</p> <p>1 (OPT)</p> <p>1 (OPT)</p> <p>2 (HE)</p> <p>1</p>	

Q5. Do you have any other comments or feedback on the appraisal?		
Comment	Number	Outcome
from final section detrimental <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasise the national standing of the suburb • Absence of views is part of the character 	1 (HE) 1 (HE)	