

Community Action in Cuttleslowe

Community Survey 2012

Report on the Findings

Contents

Table of Figures	3
Introduction	5
1.0: Demographics of the Survey Population.	5
1.1 Age and Gender	5
1.2 Household Information	7
Households with Children	8
Households With Carers	9
1.3 Contact Preferences.....	10
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	11
1.4 Membership of the Cutteslowe Community Association	11
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	12
2.0 The Survey Questions	12
2.1 Question One: Respondents' Favourite Things About Cutteslowe.....	12
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	14
Other	14
2.2 Question Two: What Respondents Don't Like About Cutteslowe	14
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	16
2.3. Question Three: What Would Make Cutteslowe Better?	18
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	20
2.4. Question Four: What Respondents Would Like at the Community Centre.....	21
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	23
2.5. Question Five: I Would Go To Activities In The Community Centre If They Cost About ... And Were On At These Times	25
Times of Activities at Cutteslowe Community Centre	25
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	26
2.6 Question Six: I Feel Safe/Unsafe Where I Live Because	26
Those Who Feel Safe.....	27
Those Who Feel Unsafe	27
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	29
2.7 Question Seven: I Feel/ I Don't Feel Part Of The Community Because	29
Those Who Feel Part of the Community.....	30

Those Who Don't Feel Part of the Community.....	30
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	31
2.8 Question Eight: I Would Like To Help Make Cutteslowe A Better Place To Live And Would Like To	32
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	32
2.9 Question Nine: Do You Feel Cold At Home In The Winter?	33
2.10 Question Ten: Is The Price Of Gas And Electricity Preventing You Heating Your House As You Would Like?.....	34
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	36
3.0 The Youth Forum.....	39
Ideas Based on the Findings.....	42
Appendix 1	43

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Distribution of Survey Respondents by Age.....	6
Figure 2: Distribution of Survey Respondents by Gender	6
Figure 3: Age and Gender of Respondents	7
Figure 4: Respondents' Household Members	8
Figure 5: Number of Children Per Family Household.....	8
Figure 6: Percentage of Cared for/Carer Status by Gender.....	9
Figure 7: Percentage of Care/Carer Status by Age	10
Figure 8: How Respondents Would Prefer to be Contacted	10
Figure 9: Preference for Means of Contact By Age Range	11
Figure 10: Cutteslowe Community Association (CCA) Membership Status	12
Figure 11: Respondents Stated Favourite Things About Cutteslowe	13
Figure 12: Things Respondents Don't Like About Cutteslowe.....	15
Figure 13: Respondents' Views of What Would Make Cutteslowe Better.....	18
Figure 14: What Respondents Would Like to See at the Community Centre.....	21

Figure 15: Amount Respondents Prepared to Spend On Community Centre Activities	25
Figure 16: Times of the Week Respondents Would Go to Community Centre Activities	26
Figure 17: Percentage of Respondents Who Feel Safe/Unsafe in Cutteslowe.....	27
Figure 18: Respondents Who Feel Unsafe in Cutteslowe By Gender.....	28
Figure 19: Respondents Who Feel Unsafe as a Percentage of the Sample Population by Age	28
Figure 20: Respondents Who Feel/Don't Feel Part of the Community in Cutteslowe.....	29
Figure 21: Respondents Who Don't Feel Part of the Community as a Percentage of the Sample Population by Age	30
Figure 22: Respondents Who Don't Feel Part of the Community as a Percentage of the Sample Population by Gender	31
Figure 23: How Respondents Would Like to Help to Make Cutteslowe a Better Place	32
Figure 24: Respondents Who Feel Cold in the Winter	33
Figure 25: Percentage of Respondents Feeling Cold or Not By Age Group	34
Figure 26: Percentage of Respondents For Whom Energy Prices are Preventing Them Heating Their House As They Would Like	35
Figure 27: Percentage of Respondents for Whom Energy Prices are a Limiting Factor by Age Range	36
Figure 28: Percentage of Youth Forum Participants by Gender and Age.....	40

List of Tables

Table 1: Youth Forum - Things I like/Don't Like about Cutteslowe	40
--	----

Introduction

Community led planning has been a way to bring together local people of Cutteslowe to better understand their priorities for improvement and to focus on the spending of funding on projects which will have the greatest impact. This will improve community cohesion, community trust, community involvement and increased social capacity and as a result create a more empowered community.

This report gives the results of a door-to-door surveys by local volunteers with support from officers and community workers in the 'survey area' of Cutteslowe. The survey questionnaire was developed in consultation with various Cutteslowe Community partner groups, and is presented in Appendix 1. The Report is organised by the questions asked in the survey, starting with the demographics of the survey population and then working through the eleven survey questions asked:-

1. My favourite things about Cutteslowe are ...
2. The things I don't like about Cutteslowe are ...
3. I think Cutteslowe would be better if ...
4. At the Community Centre I'd like to see ...
5. I would go to activities in the community if they cost about... and were on at these times ...
6. I feel safe/unsafe where I live because...
7. I feel/ I don't feel part of the Community because ...
8. I would like to help make Cutteslowe a better place to live and would like to ...
9. Do you feel cold at home in the winter? Yes/No
10. Is the price of gas and electricity preventing you heating your house as you would like? Yes/No
11. What else?

1.0: Demographics of the Survey Population.

A total of 179 survey questionnaires were completed, 2 of which were jointly completed (by 2 people), making a total of **181 respondents**. This section details the demographics of the survey population ('*A little bit about you*') namely: age; gender; household occupancy (numbers, carers); contact details & preferences; and Cutteslowe Community Association (CCA) membership status.

1.1 Age and Gender

Figure 1 shows a majority cluster of respondents (35.9%) aged between 25 and 44. Adult groups aged over 44 and youths (aged 16-24¹) are quite evenly distributed. Children (aged 14 and under) are underrepresented in this survey (1%), however a

¹ The United Nations defines 'youth', as those persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years (<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/youth/youth-definition/>).

Youth Forum was attended by 13 young people aged between 11 to 19, and the results are presented later in this report.




Figure 1: Distribution of Survey Respondents by Age

Figure 2 shows the distribution of the sample population by gender. There is a majority of female respondents (54%), and then 30% male respondents and 16% who did not state gender.




Figure 2: Distribution of Survey Respondents by Gender

Figure 3 shows the spread of gender across age, where females aged between 25 and 44 are the most represented group in the survey and male (and female) youths the least represented.




Figure 3: Age and Gender of Respondents

1.2 Household Information

114 respondents (63%) answered the question about who they live with. Of the sample population, 76 (42%) respondents stated that they lived with their partner, 15 (8%) that they lived with other members of their family (for example a parent or parents, grandparents, daughter), and 4 (2%) that they lived with flat/house mates.




Figure 4: Respondents' Household Members

Households with Children

Of the 181 sample population, 59 (32.5%) stated that they lived with children, and 3 (1.65%) stated that they were expecting a child. Of those households with children, the majority (43%) have 1 child, 32% have 2 children; 10% have 3 children; 8% have four children; 2% have 5 children and 5% are expecting a child (See Figure 5).




Figure 5: Number of Children Per Family Household

Of the 62 respondents with or expecting children, 41 (66%) stated they were living with their partner. The remaining 21 (34%) did not state if/that they were living with anyone else. Thus **of families with children**, there *may* be an estimated 34% (one third) single parent/guardian households.

Households With Carers

A total of 39 (21.5%) respondents answered the question: 'I care for someone/ I am cared for'. Based on these figures, carers make up 18% of the sample population, and those being cared for make up 3%. Figure 6 shows the percentage of cared for/carer status by gender, where 65% of carers are female, and 83% of those being cared for are male.




Figure 6: Percentage of Cared for/Carer Status by Gender

The majority of carers (44%) are aged 35-44: this may reflect the fact that some (though not all) parents stated themselves as carers (of their children) though it is not clear as only a few respondents offered information about these roles:-

- **Who they were caring for:** children (5); my wife (2); daughter with special needs (1) and tenant/friend (1)
- **Who was caring for them:** council support worker (1) carers (1).

Figure 7 shows the percentage distribution of cared for/carers within each age range group: there are more carers than cared for people in all groups except the Over 75s and youths (aged 15 to 24).




Figure 7: Percentage of Care/Carer Status by Age

1.3 Contact Preferences

128 respondents (71%) stated how they would prefer to be contacted (note that often two or more options are stated). Figure 8 shows the results, where the majority preference is email (45%); and then post (33%) phone (14%) and text (8%).




Figure 8: How Respondents Would Prefer to be Contacted

Figure 9 shows the distribution of contact preference across age range, showing that the popular options of both email and post are fairly evenly distributed across age, though youths (15-24) prefer phone to post. 117 respondents (64%) said they would be happy to be contacted again after the survey.




Figure 9: Preference for Means of Contact By Age Range

Ideas Based on the Findings

Email is both a popular option and the most efficient and cheapest form of communication, and post is the second most popular option. Thus it would be advisable to:-

1. seek ways to encourage more members of the community to sign up to email communications (e.g. collect emails and addresses via the Visitors book at reception)
2. keep a database of addresses of those who prefer this method in order of streets/postcodes for targeted leaflet/newsletter drop rounds.
3. Campaign to get people to visit/sign up to ('like') other forms of online communication such as the CCA Facebook page (which feeds through daily/weekly updates on events/information) and the CCA website.

1.4 Membership of the Cutteslowe Community Association

As Figure 10 shows, there is a lack of interest in joining Cutteslowe Community Association (CCA): of the 116 respondents who answered the question 'I am/am not

a member of the ', only 7 (4%) of respondents stated they were CCA members (5 females and 2 males).




Figure 10: Cutteslowe Community Association (CCA) Membership Status

Ideas Based on the Findings

The data suggests a need to rethink the CCA membership scheme, which was made free to join in May 2012 due to low uptake (and which previously cost £3). There needs to be

1. A clear incentive for people to join the CCA whether it is free or at a cost (for example discounts for members)
2. Communication of the who, what and why of the CCA to the community
3. An understanding of the function of the CCA membership scheme for the CCA

2.0 The Survey Questions

2.1 Question One: Respondents' Favourite Things About Cutteslowe




Figure 11: Respondents Stated Favourite Things About Cutteslowe

All respondents answered question one, and most named a number of favourite things that they liked about Cutteslowe. As Figure 11 illustrates, the park is by far the most popular feature of the area (65% named it as a favourite thing). After the park, favourite things become more individual, reflecting the different age groups and interests of the survey population. Many like the quiet (20%) and appreciate the location and transport connections (20%) and the people in the area (16%). Next, people like the shop (14%), and some enjoy the community spirit (14%), the school (14%), their neighbours (13%) and the outdoor area (11%). Fifteen people (8%) identified the Children's Centre as a favourite, reflecting the activities of parents with young children within the sample population. In contrast, very few people (2%) noted the play scheme as a favourite.

Only 13 respondents identified the Community Centre (7%) as a favourite thing, which suggests there is room for improving the experience of the centre perhaps as a more central hub of Cutteslowe, and one which more of the community could enjoy

There were many individual comments which are not reflected in Figure 11, for example one person likes the mobile library, another Wolvercote Farmers market, several stated just that they liked Cutteslowe and so forth (see footnote²).

² **Other:** Wolvercote Farmers Market: Architecture; Fair; Good community groups - Afzal is community leader; Everything looked after; Mobile library; It's absolutely wonderful; I feel comfortable, safe, happy - happy to bring up my daughter here; Small houses so families live here, not HMOs; Happy to

Ideas Based on the Findings

Cotteslowe Park

The park is a central feature of Cotteslowe and by far a favourite feature for Cotteslowe residents, and this raises the question of why the Community Centre is not located in the park? It is suggested that:-

1. Having the Community Centre facilities/hub/activities in the park would meet the need for a central community meeting place and activities space expressed in this report.
2. Having the park as a Community Centre location would draw on the attraction of the park to bring people together and create a sense of community spirit and pride in the area, and it would improve the experience of the Community Centre as an attractive central hub which serves the wide range of ages and interests in the community.
3. Security of the Park: there is a need for security both because the park is vulnerable to break-ins and for safety of people using the park, especially if community activities become more of a feature there.

Other

The bus service in Cotteslowe is valued and the report suggests that it:-

1. needs monitoring for any negative changes
2. People would like more evening buses and this could be reported to the bus companies.

Comparatively few people mentioned the services/facilities on Cotteslowe as among their favourite things (for example the shop, the playground, the Children's Centre, the community centre), and other sections of this report address the recommended improvements that would raise the profile of these.

2.2 Question Two: What Respondents Don't Like About Cotteslowe

be in a bungalow; Great for the dog; Market at Kidlington; Fishing; Clean, no vandalism; tea and chat at the church, church serve in the Pavilion; not too big an estate; gardens; lack of burglaries, joy riding, anti-social behaviour - has all improved immensely'; Feral youngsters' have improved!; Tennis courts, table tennis, cricket; Allotments; Laundry room in Hawksmore flats. Very happy here; nice area; Close for kids; Lovely area, here 20 years; It's home!; Lived here a long time; Been here 27 years; Been here 6 years - no problem with anyone




Figure 12: Things Respondents Don't Like About Cutteslowe

The majority of respondents answered question two, often stating several things that they don't like about Cutteslowe. 32 respondents (18%) did not like the behaviour of youths in the area. Specific comments include, for example: 'youth, especially in the evenings'; 'Young men in groups in street - and on Jackson Road corner, Loud in evening and drinking' and 'young people driving too fast, noise/music, drugs, kids playing in street'. Other major dislikes include dog fouling (12%) and litter (10%). Whilst 20% of respondents appreciate bus service/location (Figure 11), some (6%) do not (Figure 12). Another concern is the lack of local shops (6%), where some specified they would like to see a small supermarket/convenience shop, a fish and chip shop and/or other take away services, and a clothes shop, and others remembered when there used to be a local butchers. Some people (5%) complained about parking problems, that there are too many parking restrictions/permits, that there is a need an additional disabled bay, that the school car park is too small and that parking not policed. In addition, some 4% complained about the car parking prices at the park. Traffic was identified as an issue for some (5%), specifying the ring road and under path as a problem, that traffic is too fast and there is a need for speed bumps.

Some people (4%) find the area noisy, for example in the mornings and at night, with one complaining about dogs barking at night, and another about noise in the subway. Neighbour issues were cited by 3% of respondents, with some identifying noisy neighbours and disputes. 2% stated that there was a lack of facilities and

things to do for young people/teenagers, and 2% stated that there was no pub, café or other focal point to meet. A few people (2% respectively) stated that they don't like: the community centre decor, divides in the community and alcohol/drug abuse.

Ward Profiles

Various other individual comments were made which might be categorised as general social problems in Cutteslowe (see footnote³). There is a sense that the area suffers from a lack of cohesive identity, which may be a symptom of Cutteslowe being sidelined due to the political map - whilst Cutteslowe is a distinct area, it is not identified as such by the City Council Ward Profiles. The problem is compounded because Cutteslowe is divided not only physically, by the ring road, but also politically, by being divided and incorporated into two other Ward profiles: Wolvercote and Summertown, both of which seem likely to have very different profile (for example higher standard of living) to the Cutteslowe area.

On a more positive note, 28 respondents (15%) stated that there was nothing they did not like about the area.

Ideas Based on the Findings

Youth Behaviour

Youth behaviour is the main thing that people do not like about Cutteslowe. The report as whole suggests there is a need for:-

1. More activities for young people, especially those over 8, and that this need no doubt contributes to the levels of anti social youth behaviour experienced in the area; a youth centre would be the ideal
2. A central meeting place that is attractive to young people and that can offer age differentiated inspiring and engaging spaces and activities including sport activities and clubs

³ **Other** Steps of the Centre seen as place for people to loiter - a tad uninviting; Burglaries; Screaming parents; Nothing for older people; Ice cream van at 8 pm; Rat run for school; Unruly children; bad parenting; yobs moved here from Blackbird Leys/Barton; stones thrown at my car; shouting, aggression; benefit fraud; Problem families; violence; issues with property washing machine, water system; Shops are expensive; children, People not being careful, Lighting (Harefields); poor wheelchair access e.g. to the park; Estate has been forgotten; Council tenants at the back; Houses and gardens unkempt; Insufficient cyclist provision, too many people in wheelchairs; apartments at Harefields; Newspaper stories about estate; stolen property dumped; Wyatt Road; Graffiti; Scruffy houses; Decisions made on behalf of residents (bus shelter); Wren Road willow trees dangerously neglected; Gardens not being maintained; Low level crime; Second field is a waste of space; Police chasing around in cars; odd little gangs; Children playing on shed roofs; de-moralised estate; No cash machine; Cyclist riding on pavement; House prices; Difficult to meet people.

3. Greater community police presence to help manage anti-social behaviour

Dog Fouling

Dog fouling is the second most common thing people do not like about Cutteslowe. Ideas about this include:-

1. Surveying where the problem is (is it particular areas like the park or certain dog walking routes?)
2. Providing dog litter bins along these routes and notices which warn about dog fouling fines etc.
3. Providing dog owner training classes at the community centre (this could help address dog mess issues and the problem of noisy dogs in the area through direct training and then indirectly as dog owners share advice)
4. Providing dog 'poop bags' and holders (which attach to the lead) or selling these at the community centre
5. Having a dog fouling clear up day alongside a launch of an anti-dog fouling campaign in the area

Litter

Litter in Cutteslowe is another common concern. Suggestions include:-

1. Surveying the litter problem areas and the provision of bins and providing more public waste bins where needed
2. Organising a litter clean up day alongside a *Keep Cutteslowe Tidy* campaign.
3. There is an offenders scheme in Cutteslowe - offenders could be organised to help with litter as part of their community service
4. Litter control could be part of a wider incentive, for example by organising a 'best kept' type committee if there are awards for such city areas?

Bus Service: Report to the local bus companies about the need for better connections, seats at the bus stop for seniors, evening buses etc.

Lack of Shops

The report as a whole shows the need for more local shops, food outlets and meeting places. Ideas about this include:-

1. Business feasibility study for pubs, chip shop, other shops

2. Explore the possibility of a free parking bay area for a food van (e.g. kebabs) or for a subsidised licence if the business is less feasible (for example than a city centre outlet)
3. Explore the potential for running small business classes at the Community Centre with an emphasis on setting up a small business

General Social Problems and Ward Profiles

1. Request a review of the City Council Ward Profile Map in order to establish Cutteslowe as an independent Ward Profile. This will enable the area to have a more realistic profile, and one which will facilitate help to meet the needs of its constituents.

Other

1. Provide a disabled parking bay outside the Community Centre
2. Request a traffic/parking assessment of the area from the City Council

2.3. Question Three: What Would Make Cutteslowe Better?




Figure 13: Respondents' Views of What Would Make Cutteslowe Better

The majority of respondents gave their views on what would 'make Cutteslowe better', often stating more than one thing. The results are shown in Figure 13.

Children and Youths: 13.8% stated that the area needed more activities/facilities for children over 8 years old, and 10.5% stated that more for 4-7 year olds would be an improvement. In addition, 5.5% suggested more holiday activities. No specific suggestions were made.

Shops and Facilities: 13.8% of respondents said that more shops, and a greater range of shops, would be an improvement (suggestions included a large convenience shop or local supermarket, a butchers and shops for older 'young' people). In addition, 6.6% said that Cutteslowe would be better if there were more facilities, for example a local pub or licensed place to meet (some suggested the community centre should have a licence), a café and local takeaways (fish and chips; pizza). Other facilities stated include: toilet at park; improve facilities for older people; a church; better use of space on the field; and that the park could be used more, not many people over there - could link to schools/ Olympics?

More activities were suggested by 11% of respondents suggested more activities would make Cutteslowe better. Specific suggestions include: courses for foreign people so they can go onto further education or work; Barbeque; More to do; Skate park to be more versatile; More at the community centre - Saturday evening socials, quiz night, dance - reciprocate with other centres; Community Festivals; More in the evenings; mosaic workshop (like Headington); activities for entire family; activities for disabled people; a job club; community lunch in the holidays; Crèches; More things for the elderly; health clubs; use the park for activities; picnic in the park.

More opportunities to meet others was suggested by 10.5% of respondents. Whilst specific examples were not given, this would include the general theme of having more activities on offer in the area, and places to meet, such as **a pub, licensed premises and café.**

Improve Home/Area Appearances was suggested by 9.4% of respondents. There were some very specific suggestions, for example to sort out the gardens and maintenance in Jackson Road; council tenants kept their drive and garden in good repair; a warden or steward for new build in Wyatt Road; as well as a general feeling that people could improve on looking after their front gardens and maintaining their properties ("keep it nice for everyone, sense of pride; Improve the image of the area" and "everybody to be given a sense of pride"). Other suggestions were for less litter and less dog mess (with one suggesting to give free bags for dog fouling); repairs to roads and pavements, and for the council to be more responsive to repairs.

Better Policing was suggested by 6.1% of respondents, with a call for more police visibility (walking the streets); more Community Officers; addressing antisocial

behaviour; PCSO to patrol 7 - 9 pm; community watch people; street wardens; council enforced rules; and tackling drug users in the area.

Better Traffic/Parking Management was suggested by 6.1% of respondents, including better organisation of parking, abandoning permits, improving disabled parking facilities, improving the safety of the turn into Harefields and slowing down the traffic.

Better Community Behaviour was called for by 5.5% of respondents, with specific examples such as: parents to be accountable for their children; ASBOs for children; people to be more considerate; more residents to contribute to the economy; less noise; more community spirit/stronger sense of community; more village feel - shops, picnics, post office - everyone needs to pull their weight; for kids to play ball in the park, not the residential area; everyone to get involved.

Better Publicity/Communication was suggested by 3.9% of respondents, with one specific suggestion of sending email updates

Better Bus Service was suggested by 3.9% of respondents, specifically asking for more local buses, more frequent buses, a better evening bus service and better bus connections.

General: Other individual suggestions include: No more fairs; Paradigm Housing Association should be more responsive; Attract people from outside of the area to create a buzz; more organisation; city council/association can help create community involvement; better quality schools/youth services; better doctors opening hours; wheelchair access; more library buses.

Nothing: A few respondents said there were no improvements, specifically one said "I am very, very happy to be here - first time in my life I've been so happy", and others that "bus service has improved, and policing has improved a great deal (street fighting 25 years ago)" and that Cutteslowe was "so much better than Blackbird Leys".

Ideas Based on the Findings

Some of the recommendations that this section points to have already been covered, for example the need for youth based activities/ a youth centre; more local shops/a take-away/ a pub; a traffic/parking review/ and so forth. In addition, the following Suggestions are made:-

1. An overarching scheme to encourage taking pride in the appearance of the area which includes addressing the litter and dog fouling problems, and the establishment of a local volunteer committee to oversee the scheme
2. A review of the activities on offer at the Community Centre and the communication of events there (see later)

3. Review the possibility of funding the provision of an **outdoor gym** (possibly in the park). This would address a number of issues including providing: a central meeting space; an activity that would be attractive to people of all ages, from young adults/teens to seniors; a healthy, fun social activity for all; a valued facility that would inspire a sense of pride in the area - people would value this facility.
4. Request a review of the police strategy and operations for the area
5. Develop a local volunteer-based Neighbourhood Watch scheme which will help to build and support better community behaviour and a sense of community spirit. The provision of a youth centre/activities would complement this activity
6. Request a review of the traffic calming measures in the area (speed bumps or 20 mph limits?)

2.4. Question Four: What Respondents Would Like at the Community Centre




Figure 14: What Respondents Would Like to See at the Community Centre

The majority of respondents made suggestions for what they would like to see at Cutteslowe Community Centre (CCC), often suggesting a number of things each (Figure 14).

Children's Activities: The most popular suggestion was for more children's' activities (16.6%), which fits with the view from Question 3 that Cutteslowe would be better if there were more things for young people to do. Specific suggestions include: homework club (2.8%), and then offering crèche with all activities; summer scheme for children; a play scheme for under 5's; library for children; less of the Jesus Army; somewhere to 'hang out' for younger people; Brownies; Cubs; Boy Scouts. **Youth Club:** 8.8% of respondents said they would like age differential youth clubs at the CCC. 4.4% of respondents would like activities tailored to **children with special needs**. 5% of respondents asked for **affordable childcare at the CCC**.

Sports/ Exercise and Dance Activities: 13.8% would like to see more sports at the CCC, and 11% would like more dance activities. Specific suggestions include: martial arts (4.4%) and then Pilates, Pilates for beginners; Tai chi in the evenings; Tai Chi (all ages); aerobics; tennis; zumba (evenings); archery, boxing, fencing; gardening; yoga; self defence; exercise classes in the evenings and at weekends; and running.

More Spaces to Meet Others: 9.9% of respondents said they would like more spaces to meet others. This could include the array of suggested clubs, events and activities, a community café (see below), or a licensed bar at the CCC. One suggestion was to hold Community Welcomes ("getting to know you" events)

Community Café: 9.4% of respondents made the suggestion of a community café, and this could serve as a central meeting place for the community. Specific suggestions include: supper club for children not looked after at home; enjoy meals together, get kids involved; seniors lunch club more often

Arts and Crafts: 7.2% of respondents asked for arts and crafts activities at the CCC, including specific suggestions for: upholstery; knitting, sewing groups/ needlework; mosaic making; photography

Adult Learning at the CCC was suggested by 6.6% of respondents. Some specifically asked for EFL courses, and for IT/computing (3.9%).

Clothes Swaps/Second hand Sales: were suggested by 5% of respondents, including car boot sales.

Outdoor/Nature Activities: were suggested by 5.5% of respondents, including gardening and a night time walk.

Other Classes: cookery (2.2%); drama club (2.8%); language (3.3%)

Suggestions given for Social Activities/Evening Events include: it's a knock out competition; whist, crib, poker and bridge - tournaments; community events, parties; family events; bingo; community cinema/film screenings; fireworks; music nights; entertainment; food events/barbeque; balloon festival; craft fair; Christmas events; talent show; and a Christmas and New Year's party for everyone.

Seniors: suggestions were made for: attracting more men to the Senior's Club; weekly seniors club; older people's activities; lunch club more often; gentle exercise for seniors; something practical that makes you mix with others

Clubs/Groups - suggestions include: dog owners group; chess club; carers support; sewing group; Homework club

Music - suggestions include: Classical concerts; Music events; Singing, music, choir

Employed People: More activities for working people (evenings and weekends)

Services: Suggestions for services include Benefits advice (2.8%); and then payphone; credit union; health advice (specifically diabetic health); free IT; wheelchair accessible activities; carers support; loop system in the hall for those with hearing difficulties; transport to community centre for some; community transport; better toilets - especially for the boys; and mental health courses.

Some suggested offering volunteer positions such as 'become a street representative, help an elderly person learn IT', which should be based at the community centre so they can learn from each other

Other Suggestions

Communications: Improved communication of events/activities at CCC

CCA AGM: Have AGM in the evening

Equipment: need for: decent piano/keyboard for concerts; pool table; more equipment for clubs; seating at the park football pitches

Other: A friendly, cared for environment which is supported by the community; more free activities; Charge for activities - ease reliance on grants; Janitorial function - people on duty more often, easily accessible and reception staff; Less graffiti; Fewer people hanging around; Cleanliness

Ideas Based on the Findings

1. Rethink the activities on offer for children and youths (including clubs, classes, facilities, sports activities and so forth)

2. Encourage local teachers to establish classes at the CCC through incentive schemes address the financial start-up costs for example of testing the popularity of a new tai chi or palates class.
3. Review pricing structure of the CCC hire for certain classes: for example could offer a choice of charges either by hall hire by the hour OR charge by a percentage of attendance/ takings for each class
4. Explore possibility of funding for an outdoor gym in association with CCC
5. Establish a regular weekly Community Café and develop a business plan to make this a long term feasible (self funding) function of the CCC. Ideally the café would be open on a daily basis, including for after school and would raise, rather than use, funds.
6. Promote the function of the CCC as a venue for local social functions - dances, bingo, sales and so forth. Establish local volunteer committees for different calendar events (Christmas; New Year; Easter; Mayday; Midsummer etc). Such events will help to support the development of a greater sense of community and community spirit.
7. Explore possible funding avenues for subsidising activities/classes at CCC
8. Approach the City Council for help in developing an Adult Education programme for classes at the CCC.
9. Explore a collaboration with local DJs to run youth discos fortnightly
10. Apply for a licensed premises status for evening social events (dances/bingo)
11. Consider establishing a social club (bar) within the CCC (as other community centres do?)
12. Research the ways other Oxford Community Centres are run: what can be learnt/what resources can be shared?
13. Explore funding possibilities for a refurbishment of the CCC
14. What is the potential the CCC having access to/use of the park facilities (buildings) to extend their activities? The Community Café and social club/licensed venue would ideally be situated within the park that the people of Cutteslowe value so much and which would be the ideal setting. Social functions at the Pavilion would be an attractive feature for local Cutteslowe residents and as such would contribute to long term financial funding and self sufficiency.

2.5. Question Five: I Would Go To Activities In The Community Centre If They Cost About ... And Were On At These Times ...

Cost of Activities at Cutteslowe Community Centre

Just over 100 (58%) of respondents answered Question Five. As Figure 15 shows, 34% of the sample population stated that they would be prepared to pay between £0 - £5.00 for an activity at the CCC, making this by far the most popular price range. 13% would pay between £5 and £10, and only 1% would pay between £10 and £15.




Figure 15: Amount Respondents Prepared to Spend On Community Centre Activities

Times of Activities at Cutteslowe Community Centre

As Figure 16 shows, the majority of respondents would prefer to attend CCC events and activities in the evenings (16%) and at weekends (8%), and, for children/parents, after school (6.6%). In addition, some respondents specified they would attend weekday evenings (3.3%) and weekend evenings (2.2%). 14.4% said they would attend during the week: weekday afternoons (6.6%), weekday mornings (5%) and weekday daytime (2.8%). For a few (1.1%) the time they can attend varies. Overall, evenings/after school are the most popular time for people.




Figure 16: Times of the Week Respondents Would Go to Community Centre Activities

Ideas Based on the Findings

1. Schedule more evening, after school and weekend activities
2. Review the costing structure of hall hire/classes and events costs: is it possible to create a viable model where class prices can be kept below £5?
3. What funding is available to subsidise privately run classes (e.g. Zumba etc)
4. What funding is available to establish services, e.g. education classes for all ages

2.6 Question Six: I Feel Safe/Unsafe Where I Live Because ...

178 (98%) of respondents answered Question Six. Of the sample population, 77% said that they feel safe where they live, and 21% said they felt unsafe (See Figure 17).




Figure 17: Percentage of Respondents Who Feel Safe/Unsafe in Cuttesslowe

Those Who Feel Safe

Of those who feel safe, some specified reasons, for example because: they know Cuttesslowe and they know the local PSCO there is not much traffic; good street lighting and decent populace; security door to flats; police have been helpful; have good burglar alarm; area has improved enormously; safer now than 20 years ago.

Those Who Feel Unsafe

Gender

Of the 21% of respondents who said they felt unsafe, 15% were female and 6% were male. As shown in Figure 18, of the sample population of those who stated their gender⁴, 27% (27 out of 99) of the females felt unsafe and 18% (10 out of 56) of the males felt unsafe.

⁴ [181- 26 (gender not given) = 155]




Figure 18: Respondents Who Feel Unsafe in Cuttesslowe By Gender

Age

Figure 19 shows the respondents who feel unsafe as a percentage of the sample population by age. Half (50%) of under 14 year olds said they felt unsafe, though the small sample (2 respondents) should be noted. A third (33.3%) of youths (15-24 year olds) and 35-44 year olds feel unsafe. Similarly, nearly a third (30.8% and 26.1% respectively) of 65-74 year olds and over 75s feel unsafe.




Figure 19: Respondents Who Feel Unsafe as a Percentage of the Sample Population by Age

Why Respondents Feel Unsafe

Of those who said they felt unsafe, a variety of personal reasons were given, for example: *"My husband was assaulted in the park by local teenagers"; "2 recent attacks to house, man in garden"; "1 got beaten up in the house - someone walked in, door was open"; "Car theft recently" and "At night with a large group of youth, with their dogs (Wren Road)".*

Other individual comments included: muggings and burglaries; car on fire; police regularly here; evening especially late at night, young people, break ins; subway; young people; rough sleepers increased; ROAD!; lack of security lighting in the park, gate on park at night time; evening - "hoodies" come out, shout and are intimidating; dogs, gangs, drugs, youths; lack of police support; don't want illegals, everyone should be registered; and alcohol and drug use/dealing

Ideas Based on the Findings

1. Review police strategy for the area
2. Establish Neighbourhood Watch groups ; Again - more activities/facilities for youths
3. Improve safety/security for people using the park (review security there)

2.7 Question Seven: I Feel/ I Don't Feel Part Of The Community Because ...

The majority (56%) of the survey population stated that they do feel like part of the Cuttleslowe community, however just over one quarter (26%) stated that they do not (Figure 20).




Figure 20: Respondents Who Feel/Don't Feel Part of the Community in

Cutteslowe

Those Who Feel Part of the Community

Of those respondents who said they feel part of the community, some made personal comments about this. Several mentioned that they had met, know or speak with their neighbours or that they know others in the community (hairdresser, people through school or the children's centre).) Other comments include expressing a sense that they could do more to be involved and that "*the community is so diverse - difficult not to feel a part!*"

Those Who Don't Feel Part of the Community

Figure 21 shows respondents who don't feel part of the community as a percentage of the sample population by age. Over the spread of age groups from age 15 - 74, an average of over a quarter of respondents or more (33.3% of 35-44 year olds; 44.4% of 45-54 year olds; and 35% of 55-64 year olds) said they did not feel like part of the community.




Figure 21: Respondents Who Don't Feel Part of the Community as a Percentage of the Sample Population by Age

As Figure 22 shows, feeling not part of the community is not influenced particularly by gender: of those in the sample population who stated their gender, 30% of the females and 26.8% of the males do not feel they are part of the community.




Figure 22: Respondents Who Don't Feel Part of the Community as a Percentage of the Sample Population by Gender

Of those respondents who said that they did not feel part of the community, some made individual comments to explain. Five respondents mentioned that they did not have enough time to be involved in things; around 7 people said they were new to the area; others that there were not enough events or places to meet people, or that there was no community to be part of. Other reasons included: liking to "mind my own business"; "not my kind of people"; illness (e.g. back problems/being disabled) prevented some for joining in; or that they hadn't really tried to be part of the community.

Ideas Based on the Findings

1. Hold '*getting to know you*' type events at the CCC
2. Running events during evenings/weekends for those who work
3. Community Café/Bar/Social Club
4. Outdoor Gym

2.8 Question Eight: I Would Like To Help Make Cutteslowe A Better Place To Live And Would Like To ...

Respondents were asked to select from a list of possible activities they would be prepared to do to help make Cutteslowe a better place. The results are shown in Figure 23. Of the total survey population, 41 respondents (22.6%) stated that they would like to do one or more of the six options offered.




Figure 23: How Respondents Would Like to Help to Make Cutteslowe a Better Place

Of the sample population, 22.7% would be willing to volunteer with community projects and 20% would be happy to run a stall at a local event (20%). Helping Senior Citizens with IT (15.5%) and organising local activities (13.8%) are also popular choices, and 8.3% of respondents would offer to become a street representative, and finally 5.5% would become a Neighbourhood Watch Leader.

Ideas Based on the Findings

1. Establish committees/groups for volunteers to sign up to (needs initial leadership from trustees or staff?)
2. Hold volunteer *information and recruitment day* at the CCC followed up with an on-going recruitment board at the centre.

3. Explore possible funding for support of volunteers/volunteer based activities to cover costs for example of CRB checks; training; running costs

2.9 Question Nine: Do You Feel Cold At Home In The Winter?

Of the sample population, 166 (91.7%) of respondents answered Question Nine: 50% said they did not feel cold and 32% said they did feel cold (See Figure 24).




Figure 24: Respondents Who Feel Cold in the Winter

Figure 25 shows the percentage of respondents feeling cold or not by age group. Perhaps surprisingly, of those aged between 65 and 74 and those over 75, a lower percentage reported feeling cold (23% and 27% respectively) than those not feeling cold (77% and 73% respectively). It is only in the youth age group (15-24) that a higher percentage of respondents (58%) feel the cold than those who do not (42%).




Figure 25: Percentage of Respondents Feeling Cold or Not By Age Group

2.10 Question Ten: Is The Price Of Gas And Electricity Preventing You Heating Your House As You Would Like?

Of the sample population, 36% said that the price of gas and electricity are preventing them heating their homes as they would like to, and 54% said that energy prices are not a limiting factor (Figure 26).




Figure 26: Percentage of Respondents For Whom Energy Prices are Preventing Them Heating Their House As They Would Like

Figure 27 shows the percentage of respondents for whom energy prices are a limiting factor by age range, illustrating that for the most part age is not an important factor, although those in the middle age groups (35 to 54) are less likely to compromise their heating because of energy prices and those in the youth group (15 - 24 most likely (64%). Nonetheless, across the age groups at least 28% of people are not heating their homes as they would like because of cost.




Figure 27: Percentage of Respondents for Whom Energy Prices are a Limiting Factor by Age Range

Ideas Based on the Findings

1. More in depth needs assessment of those who are struggling to heat their homes

11. What else?

Question Eleven asked respondents what else they would like to add, and 53 (29%) of the sample population made comments. Note that many of the comments seem relevant to other questions, but in any case they have been sorted into categories as follows:-

Community Centre

"Community centre to be of a hub; wider range of activities; few upgrades to decor e.g. brighter colours and upholster sofa in 'TV room"

"The toilets need refurbishment"

"Hold careers advice service and clarify benefits of being employed"

"Community gardening"

*"People don't know about the community centre - need to advertise more;
Cutteslowe Connection - delivery has been sporadic; Notice board to be changed -
not to duplicate notices"*

On the Survey

*"**Survey** would be more representative if distributed when more people are at home
and likely to be in"*

*"Delighted the council is doing something about the community centre. Important to
drop in map to show where Templar Road shops are"

Children's Centre

"I am a childminder and hear that staff in Children's Centre 'pounce' - puts mums off"

Health

"Don't want to get involved - have arthritis so can't walk far"

"Difficult to get a doctor's appointment, always see someone different"

Crime/Security

"Hanging baskets have been stolen. More community policing - visible"

*"Something wrong with the buzzer in our block - when front door slams it sets off
buzzer in our flat (HT to send through to Housing Team at OCC)"*

"Policing in the evenings in the parks"

Park

"Trees in the park need topping - affects TV signal and light into flat"

"When is the Friends of Parks AGM?"

"Would be good to use the park more often"

Property/Heating

"Properties should be maintained"

"Social housing getting triple glazed due to noise of traffic, ventilation doesn't work"

"Lack of insulation"

"Still getting cold calling - have advised 101"

"It's got to the point where I seriously think about the fuel I am using. Lived here since '95 but don't want to"

Council

"OCC should take more active role in knowing where people live, what they are doing, illegal immigrants, provide better communication"

"Conditions of roads and footpaths"

"Weekly rubbish collections preferred"; "concerned about uncollected rubbish"

Parking: "Parking in street because of charges in the park"; "Parking restrictions - visitors have trouble with them"

"Objects to immigrants being granted council houses"

"Need road bumps to control traffic"

"You can't get the Council to do anything - e.g. re-pointing 73 Wentworth"

"Council could do more about slabs outside front of house which caused a trip"

"Council property - not insulated"

Elderly

"Bench needed for elderly at bus stop"

"Is it right the elderly remain in large homes?"

Being Included

"Would like to have the opportunity to share views"

"When are the Friends of Parks AGM?"

General

"Blackbird Leys, Rose Hill and Barton get everything, Cutteslowe is forgotten"

"used to live in Blackbird Leys and there is much less available over here"

Dog Fouling: "Dog fouling - Holt Weer close to subway, signal for TV is really bad, problems with 10 Holt Weer with parties, no lighting at skate park"," Dog fouling a problem"

"Need help to reduce energy costs"

"Have something for young and old and the bit in between"

Children/Youth

"Keen to see improvement in the Primary School"

"More to occupy older children"

"Engage teenagers - incentives for helping? Local government funding?"

Positive Comments

"Maintaining independence is good"

"Lots of support from my daughters"

"Nice area, healthy mix of classes, positive fun people"

"Love the corner shop on Islip road, good bread and Radio Times"

"Really good place to live - lot more rough when I was growing up. Good facilities"
"Happy here"

"If we all did something we would all achieve more"

Offers of Help

"I can analyse electricity and gas tariffs for people in fuel poverty"

"Keen to help out with anything"

"Would happy to be contacted for the elderly or housebound people. Good to have a group for such volunteers"

"Keen to share talents and skills (electrician, plumbers, child care etc)"

3.0 The Youth Forum

As shown in Figure 28, of the thirteen participants in the youth forum, 62% were girls and 38% boys; and 62% were aged 11 - 15 (children) and 38% were aged 16-19 (youths)




Figure 28: Percentage of Youth Forum Participants by Gender and Age

Participants of the youth forum were asked to write statements about what they liked and didn't like, and these are presented in the Table 1 below.

Table 1: Youth Forum - Things I like/Don't Like about Cutteslowe

Things I like	Things I don't like
Respect	Disrespect
Some of the staff	Nothing to do
Park	Some of the people
Shops	Breaking people's trust
friends	One rule for one and another for someone else
Nothing	Nothing for older people to do (19yrs)
Skate park	We need a better skate park
Shops	No fountain for drinking
Bridge	Rude people
Sport	Cockiness
Banta	People make mountains out of little things

Chatting	Gossip that I about on estate
Youth work especially 1 to 1	Can't trust anyone
Sports	Rudeness
Corner shop	Beef
Sport	Chicks
Chatting	Chicks
Sports	Parks
Chatting	Boys
Cuttesslowe	Equipment
girls	Pens, pencils
Sports	Parks
The park	Cleanliness
The skate park and zip wire	No pub
The wooded area	Only two shops
The people in Oxo shop	Ignored by services sometimes
Chicks	Equipment
Parks	Boys
Sporting	Park is shit
Chatting	Cleanliness
Girls	Centre is too cold and tatty (looks better now)
Sport	Groups of different ages should mix more
Sing	
Park	
Community Centre	
Play scheme	
Art project	
People	

Ideas Based on the Findings

1. Youth need an arena through which to express and discuss their views and effect change, and a Youth Board based at the CCC would provide such a forum. From this, a few representatives could be appointed, with the function of bringing the youth boards views to other adult forums (for example to CCA meetings and so forth). This would raise the profile of young people and help to foster a sense of community inclusion and responsibility.
2. A youth centre/more activities, especially those that involve socialising (clubs/sports/discos etc)
3. A code of respect could be jointly developed between young people and adults in the Cutteslowe area

Appendix 1



Registered charity: 304340

Community Action in Cutteslowe

Community survey

Getting involved

1. My favourite things about Cutteslowe are

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. The things I don't like about Cutteslowe are

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. I think Cutteslowe would be better if

.....

.....

.....

.....

4. At the Community Centre I'd like to see

.....

.....

.....

.....

5. I would go to activities in the community if they cost about..... and were on at these times

6. I feel safe/unsafe where I live because

.....
.....
.....
.....

7. I feel/ I don't feel part of the Community because

.....
.....
.....
.....

8. I would like to help make Cutteslowe a better place to live and would like to

Become a 'Street Representative'	
Become a Neighbourhood Watch leader	
Organise local activities	
Run a stall at a local event	
Volunteer with community projects	
Help a senior citizen to learn about IT	

9. Do you feel cold at home in the winter?

Yes ☐

No ☐

10. Is the price of gas and electricity preventing you heating your house as you would like?

Yes

☐

No

☐

11. What else?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

A little bit about you

We are still getting to know everyone in the community, so it would really help us to do this by knowing just a little about you.

If you don't want to share this information with us though, that's OK! You can just leave it blank.

I am years old

I am male/female (*please circle*)

I live with

I care for someone/ I am cared for (*please delete*)

I prefer to be contacted by (*email/phone/text/post*)

.....

These are my contact details which I am happy for you to use:

Name

Address

Phone

Email

I am happy for you to contact me again about Community Action in Cutteslowe ☐ we
(*please tick*)

I am/am not a member of the Cutteslowe Community Association (*please
delete*)

Thank you for your time today.

Outcome of public meeting & workshop 16.10.13

A public meeting was held in Wolvercote Village Hall, 16th Oct 2013, to update residents on our work and to prioritise concerns held by them, in relation to local issues, to be published as a Neighbourhood Plan. The issues were originally identified, at a previous public meeting, 12 months before, and had been subsequently pulled together by the Steering Group to produce a Draft Plan.

More than 60 people attended the meeting and there was reasonable representation from each section of the Wolvercote Ward. The percentage of participants, locality by locality, was as follows:

Cotteslowe Park (east of Banbury Road & north of A40)	9%
Upper Wolvercote (east of Birmingham railway & west of Bicester railway)	15%
Lower Wolvercote (west of Birmingham railway)	28%
Woodstock Road (south of A40 & east of Bicester railway)	13%
Five Mile Drive (north of A40, east of Bicester railway & west of Banbury Rd.)	31%
Other (locality undefined)	4%

Following a presentation, groups seated at tables were encouraged to discuss all the issues set out in the Draft Outline Plan (printed below – but presented in précis form at the meeting). Three issues in the Plan were not discussed, since it was assumed that these (**Drainage and infrastructure / Risk of flooding / Traffic and parking**) were already at the top of everybody's list of concerns - depending on where they live. At the end of the session each individual was given four votes to put against those other issues which he/she thought most important.

The **overall results** of the voting revealed the priority order of the remaining concerns to be:

1. Noise and air pollution
2. Schooling
- 3= Green spaces and biodiversity /Building Scale density and design
5. Principle of community
6. Mix of housing
7. Local employment
8. Local retail
- 9= Heritage /Energy and resource conservation
- 11= Renewable energy /Sustainability and building standards.

What next?

The issues that face us are complex and would require a huge amount of time to translate them all into a Neighbourhood Plan. We have limited resources and so we have to restrict the scope of our work. We now intend to further develop the Plan and armed with the above information we should be able to concentrate, though not exclusively, on those issues that concern you most. Further consultation will take place and we particularly want to capture the views of younger people.

Please continue to tell us what you think. Send your views to the Chair, John Bleach at 47 Rosamund Road, OX2 8NU or info@wolvercote-ap.org.uk **Any offers of help would be most welcome!**

Outcome of public meeting & workshop 16.10.13

The priorities, **by locality**, were revealed as follows:

Cotteslowe Park

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| 1= | Noise and air pollution | /Building Scale density and design | |
| 3= | Schooling | /Principle of community | /Green spaces & biodiversity |
| 6= | Local retail | /Mix of housing | /Heritage |
| 9= | Local employment | /Sustainability and building standards | |
| 11= | Renewable energy | /Energy and resource conservation | |

Upper Wolvercote

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | Schooling | | |
| 2. | Green spaces and biodiversity | | |
| 3. | Noise and air pollution | | |
| 4= | Principle of community | /Local employment | /Renewable energy |
| 7= | Building Scale density and design | /Mix of housing | /Energy and resource conservation |
| 10= | Local retail | /Heritage | |
| 12. | Sustainability and building standards | | |

Lower Wolvercote

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Noise and air pollution | | |
| 2. | Principle of community | | |
| 3. | Building Scale density and design | | |
| 4. | Green spaces and biodiversity | | |
| 5. | Schooling | | |
| 6. | Local employment | | |
| 7= | Local retail | /Mix of housing | |
| 9. | Sustainability and building standards | | |
| 10= | Heritage | /Energy and resource conservation | |
| 12. | Renewable energy | | |

Woodstock Road

- | | | | |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1= | Noise and air pollution | /Building Scale density and design | |
| 3. | Schooling | | |
| 4= | Principle of community | /Green spaces and biodiversity | /Local retail |
| 7. | Energy and resource conservation | | |
| 8= | Local employment | /Mix of housing | /Renewable energy |
| | /Sustainability and building standards | | |
| 12. | Heritage | | |

Five Mile Drive

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. | Green spaces and biodiversity | | |
| 2= | Noise and air pollution | / Schooling | /Building Scale density and design |
| 5. | Principle of community | | |
| 6. | Mix of housing | | |
| 7= | Local employment | /Heritage | |
| 9= | Sustainability and building standards | /Local retail | /Renewable energy |
| | /Energy and resource conservation | | |

DRAFT OUTLINE PLAN - KEY ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES (v.5)

1. **Principle of community:** The Wolvercote Ward already contains several thriving communities, some of which have better facilities than others. All of them need communal facilities that will maintain and enhance social interaction. Where there is growth in population, more facilities should be provided. Research is needed to establish if there are sufficient local facilities in some areas of the Ward (e.g. between Woodstock Road and Banbury Road and to the north of Sunderland Avenue). Facilities (social, sports, worship etc) are needed for all age groups from the young to the elderly and should be maintained and enhanced regularly as a matter of course. Wherever new development takes place the design of the layout should be in sympathy with the needs of the existing community in scale and should provide both communal facilities and public open space, which is welcoming and free of cars, where people can freely and safely interact. Public open space needs also to be secure and well maintained.
2. **Schooling:** The community should support the provision of local schools. Sufficient capacity must be made available in local schools to accommodate any increases in population, especially from large developments. Consideration needs to be given to safe travel routes to schools.
3. **Local employment:** A growing number of people want to work close to their homes. This might reduce traffic and pollution. Appropriate business development contributes to a balanced community, and may provide scope for local employment. However, the infrastructure needs to be developed accordingly. Where there are larger volumes of traffic because some employees and goods have to come from outside the area, it will be necessary to ensure that roads are in good repair and able to cope. At the same time measures should be introduced to encourage the reduction of car dependence.
4. **Local retail:** Local shops have an important function in any neighbourhood, not least because they cut down on the need for travel. They should be protected by planning policy.
5. **Mix of housing:** Any new developments must be planned to avoid ghettos and gated communities. New housing should include "affordable" housing both for purchase and for rent. The rental sector should be responsibly managed, with consideration and respect for all residents. There should be firm implementation of the City's policy on Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMOs). Land should be made available for specialized types of housing, such as sheltered and extra care housing.
6. **Building scale, density and design:** It is important to attend to the scale of buildings and the density of development to ensure that any new building is appropriate in design, scale and character to its immediate neighbours. Areas for development within the Ward should be designated to ensure that the variations in scale and density accompanying different use categories are appropriately sited (for instance, housing compared with employment use). Furthermore, there should be a strict limit on the practice of infilling and the replacement of single dwellings by multiple properties to control density and car ownership. New developments should have dedicated spaces to accommodate waste disposal (wheelie bins), to keep shared spaces, including pavements, clear.
7. **Sustainability and building standards:** All new developments must be planned to be sustainable in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). To meet this requirement, new building should be highly energy efficient and meet the highest standards for sustainable design. Also improved space standards should be introduced for all new dwellings, and these standards should be made mandatory (as, for example, the standards used in public housing before 1980).
8. **Heritage:** New developments must respect nearby buildings or groups of buildings of historical significance, whether listed buildings and/or within conservation areas or not. This does not mean copying historical styles but re-interpreting the scale and grain of existing places in a contemporary way.

9. **Renewable energy:** The Plan should encourage the exploitation of the potential for renewable energy in existing housing and commercial building stock, and especially in new developments, including energy from natural features, such as rivers.
10. **Energy and resource conservation:** Every effort should be made to promote the conservation of resources, reduce air pollution and bring down fuel bills. In terms of buildings this will be achieved by the use of efficient and selective construction methods, the elimination of waste material, and the employment of advanced technology (including district heating). In terms of transport it will be achieved through the development of public transportation, encouragement of cycling, walking etc.
11. **Noise and air pollution:** The Plan will require effective steps to protect residents (both new and existing) from noise and air pollution from identified polluting sources (particularly major roads). Evidence to support proposals must be based on data obtained from actual measurements, not models. This is an issue for developers but also for the Highway Authority since the pollution levels at the Wolvercote Roundabout and almost certainly at the Cutteslowe Roundabout already exceed air quality standards. Consideration should be given to the prevention of rat running.
12. **Green spaces and biodiversity:** While acknowledging the outstanding facilities provided by Cutteslowe Park, Wolvercote Common, Wolvercote Green and Port Meadow, the Plan will support the work of local authorities, agencies, charities and local community groups in protecting and enhancing the natural environment and biodiversity of the area. It will strive to make more green space accessible to the public, while, at the same time, supporting measures to protect rare plant species and habitats. Public areas in new developments should be stocked with native tree, plant and grass species. All developments, especially large developments, should contain green spaces offering a range of character. The potential for traffic calming by creating chicanes and parking bays, using trees or shrubs in planters, could be explored.
13. **Drains and infrastructure:** The Plan will seek more rigorous checking of plans for forthcoming developments, based on measured evidence to ensure that the existing drains and roads in particular have sufficient capacity to support those developments. There is currently concern about the inadequacy of the sewerage system in Lower Wolvercote.
14. **Risk of flooding:** The Plan will seek a more rigorous approach to the provision of flood defences where these are needed. There should be careful checking of all plans for new developments to ensure that they do not add to the risk of flooding in the area and will employ appropriate techniques to attenuate surface water run-off from buildings and paving. In low-lying areas there must be a clear understanding by landowners and agencies of the causes of flooding (e.g. where existing ditch networks are blocked) and clear and (where possible) enforceable lines of responsibility for the maintenance and management of banks, ditches and weirs.
15. **Traffic and parking, alternative transport:** Road layouts should be able to cope with the volume of traffic and, where that cannot be achieved, new development should be restricted. Changes to road layouts should not take place simply to accommodate development to the detriment of conditions for existing residents. New developments need to be planned with adequate parking provision. Public transport provision needs to be enhanced. Existing roads and bridges need to be repaired and reinforced to cope with bus and emergency services and refuse collection, with contributions towards this work where appropriate from developers. Alternative means of transport (cycling and walking) need to be encouraged, through provision of safer routes.

HOUSING AND OUR COMMUNITY

Questionnaire

Final Draft 11/5/15

	<p>Please give your views on local development by answering the questions overleaf so that they can be reflected in the Wolvercote Neighbourhood Plan as it develops. This will ensure that your views are heard by the planners.</p> <p>1 The Localism Act means that planners have to pay attention to what you think. The Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum is officially recognized by Oxford City Council and now has to produce a neighbourhood plan. It has represented you by forcefully expressing local views on transport, in particular on the need for environmentally friendly facilities for travel, and on defences against the risk of flooding at every consultation, meeting and workshop since 2012.</p> <p>The Vision in the Wolvercote Neighbourhood Plan (inspired by work done in local public meetings) is to maintain and develop for this and future generations an attractive, economically vibrant and culturally lively area for people of all ages, backgrounds and interests, with a strong sense of community.</p> <p>Please return the completed questionnaire to the FREEPOST address, or complete it on-line via our website: www.wolvercotenf.org.uk BEFORE Friday 17th July.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum Steering Committee</p>
	<p>ONE QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY up to 4 persons in EACH HOUSEHOLD, aged 12 and over.</p> <p>Please answer as many questions as possible. Each person should choose a coloured column</p>

	and complete the boxes in that column only. You don't need to answer all the questions.				
A.	Address: Please state here your street and post code.				
B.	What gender are you? (<i>Insert M or F</i>)				
C.	Which age range do you fit into? (<i>Tick the relevant box</i>)				
	12 – 19				
	20 – 34				
	35 – 59				
	60 - 74				
	75 and older				
1.	Given a need for more housing, how strongly do you feel about each of the following options? (<i>Rate: 1 = strongly against to 5 = strongly in favour</i>)				
	• Some building on the Green Belt				
	• Build in back gardens				
	• Replace large houses with more houses and/or flats				
	• Build on recreation land				
	• Build on farm land				
	• Build higher				
2.	To reduce commuting should some housing on new developments, for example on the Northern Gateway, be reserved for those working there?' (<i>Y = Yes or N = No</i>)				
3.	How important is it that affordable accommodation should be provided locally to key workers (e.g. school teachers, nurses, social workers, police				

	officers, etc.)? (Rate: 1 = not important to 5 = very important)				
4.	How interested would you be in renting a small workshop space if made available on a new development? (Rate: 1 = not interested to 5 = very interested)				
5.	Wolvercote Ward has a relatively high population of elderly people. Which of the following might be helpful to you or your family? (Rate each option: 1 = not helpful to 5 = very helpful)				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sheltered housing (warden assisted) 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care home 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adapting your own home 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form of communal housing (not exclusively for the elderly), with shared facilities 				
6.	How interested would you be in building your own home ('self-building')? (Rate: 1 = not interested to 5 very interested)				
7.	Are there sufficient communal and recreational facilities in your immediate area to cater for your interests? (Y = Yes or N = No)				
	If not, which additional communal and recreational facilities would you like to see in your area? (Add your suggestions below)				
				
8.	How important is it that homes should achieve the highest possible standards to conserve energy and resources? (Rate: 1= not important to 5 = very important)				
9.	How important is it that house builders should be obliged to install systems which reduce our reliance on fossil fuels to generate energy? (Rate: 1 = not important to 5 = very important)				

10.	How important is it that the design and scale of new development is in keeping with existing buildings? (Rate 1: = not important to 5 = very important)				
11.	How important are trees and shrubs in streets? (Rate: 1 = not important to 5 = very important)				
12.	How important are the following in the management and development of green spaces? (Rate each option: 1 = not important to 5 = very important)				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preserving existing trees 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> planting new trees and shrubs 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stipulating a minimum area of green space in each development 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preserving gardens and allotments 				
13.	How do you think the character of your area could be enhanced? (Rate each option: 1 = very little to 5 = a lot, and/or add your suggestions below)				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> by planting trees 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> traffic calming 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improving street lighting 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> widening pavements 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> re-surfacing streets 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (other)..... 				
	<p>If you are not already on our mailing list and wish to receive information from us, please provide your names and email addresses here:..... </p> <p>The data collected will only be used for the purpose of developing a</p>				

	neighbourhood plan. Names and contact details will not be disclosed to any external sources.
	<p>What do you think?</p> <p>Are there any important issues that we have not identified?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Do you have any ideas of how we can resolve these issues?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
	<p>FREEPOST label here</p>
	To return, please fold the page, tuck in and post (no stamp required). Please return by 17 th July 2015. If you prefer to submit your response on-line, go to our website:

	www.wolvercotenf.org.uk
--	--




Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum was formed in 2012 to formulate a Neighbourhood Plan for our area to influence all local developments from the outset.

We would very much value your views about what we are doing.

**Join us at our AGM on
Wednesday 26th October at 7.30pm
at Wolvercote Village Hall**

If you need help getting there, why not use the community bus service?
contact Christopher Gowers by email
cwwBookingAgent@yahoo.co.uk
or by telephone
01865 512047

For more information
see our website
www.wolvercotenf.org.uk



**Our neighbourhood
is changing**

September 2016

What can we do about it?

Either we can


Wait until new plans are made public and then comment or object or even demonstrate

Or we can

Make our own neighbourhood plan to influence all developments from the start

From what you have told us through our questionnaire and public meetings, we are now drafting our plan.

DRAFT POLICIES INCLUDE:



Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum
AGM
Wednesday 26th October 2016
Wolvercote Village Hall
at 7.30 pm

Present: Steering Committee members: Christopher Hardman (Chairman) John Bleach, Richard Lawrence-Wilson (Treasurer), Mary Brown, Cllr Jean Fooks, Cllr Steve Goddard, Cllr Angela Goff, Graham Jones, David Stone, Jennifer Attoe (Secretary).

Members of the public were listed separately.

Apologies: Christopher Gowers, Jo and Nick Malden, Fran Ryan, Penny Moyle.

1. **Welcome.** Chairman welcomed the audience to the third AGM and particularly to Roger Smith of Savills. Chair explained the order of the Agenda. Draft policies were on display for inspection during the interval. These are also on the website and were displayed at Fun on the Green during the Summer Festival. Leaflets, explaining the Neighbourhood Forum's policies and progress to date have been distributed to every household in the designated area.
2. **The Minutes of the second AGM of Wednesday 14th October 2015** (previously circulated on the website and at the meeting) were proposed as correct by AG and seconded by RL-W. The minutes were then accepted.
3. **Matters Arising not elsewhere on the Agenda.** None.
4. **Chairman's Report and Progress with the Neighbourhood Plan.**

Progress with drafting sections of the plan has continued this year. It is frankly not easy to sustain rapid progress given the fact that many of those best qualified, willing and able to contribute have very busy lives. One member of the Steering Group resigned during the year partly because of pressures from business. We are very grateful to Jenny Attoe for acting as our Secretary for a year but sadly she is standing down. Once again I would like also to thank Anne Charles for her help with our website. And Phil Dove for his help once again –this time with our leaflet. I am, of course, grateful to all the other members of the Steering Committee.

During the year we have used The Flying Goose to keep in touch with local residents and will continue to do so. And of course we have delivered the leaflet to all households.

We still need more help. In particular we need more engagement with the widest possible cross-section of our community and as you will see from the Treasurer's report, more money. Consequently we are in the process of seeking a grant from Locality to try to speed up the drafting of the plan. We have had very promising discussions with a consultant who has been involved in helping Summertown and Headington whose plan has been accepted by the City Council. The target date for completion of the first draft of the plan is by the end of the next nine months. I am much more confident about this now. I have also been in contact with Summertown because there are clearly joint interests since the two Wards are contiguous. They expect to be going to six weeks public consultation at the beginning of next year. You might have a look at their plan then and even comment because people from here certainly use shops and schools in their area.

I am often asked what a completed plan looks like. There are examples available electronically . One might look at the Headington plan accepted by the city for example and you can now look at Summertown's draft plan. As I pointed out last year the policies in plans are supposed to relate to building development and land use and many of them say what kind of development they would like and identify areas where they would prefer to locate development and those areas that they consider should be protected. As you know our circumstances are rather different: the Mill Site and the Northern Gateway have already been allocated as sites for development, so we have to produce policies that will influence the nature of those developments as well as considering other smaller future developments which may change the character of local areas. Many of the most pressing concerns that people have about development in the neighbourhood are consequent upon development: flooding, congestion and pollution for example. We know too that there are strong views about affordable and key worker housing.

There has this year been one important consultation started about 'the main planning policy document for Oxford' for the next twenty years. There is a close relationship between the aims of a City Plan and a Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans have to take account of the Council's assessment of development needs contained in an approved City Plan It is therefore very important that local people do engage with the city plan, otherwise Council slogans like 'power to the people' are meaningless. There will be further steps in this consultation so look out for them. The Steering Committee of the Forum tried to get the deadline for comment extended, because the first step in this consultation was in the summer when we thought that people might well be on holiday and we wanted more and better publicised events in North Oxford, but we did not succeed. However, we responded and will continue to do so to future consultations. Our response which reflected what we know of local residents' views from the answers to our questionnaire is on our website..

I can now give brief updates on one project and the specific developments included in the minutes of our last meeting.

Godstow Abbey Project.

You will recall that last year we reported that **WE** and The School of Geography and Environmental Studies had been awarded a grant from the Higher Education Innovation Fund for a project to improve the site and to create a display board to explain the history and the conservation of the abbey.. The display Board is there and was dedicated by the Deputy Lord Lieutenant in the presence of the Lord Mayor earlier this year and from the beaten path round it it looks as if it is looked at a lot. The hope is to be able to provide a second board when we have the funds.

I would like to thank Graham Jones from our Steering Committee and Professor Heather Viles and Martin Coombes from The School of Geography and Eleanor Standley from the Ashmolean and the Department of Archaeology who did an immense amount to make this possible and to Nigel Fisher for arranging the removal of the wrong vegetation and leaving the right vegetation on the walls.

Now to bring you up to date with the proposed developments reported on last year

The 17 dwellings approved at Elsfield Hall

The planning permission requires a start on site by Aug 2017 or else the permission will lapse. Nothing has happened so far

(Elsfield Hall is therefore the primary site for the development programme earmarked to start in April 2016 and all the necessary arrangements have been made. However, the recent changes to national housing policy following the election and the July budget [specifically the RTB extension to housing

associations and the 1% social rent cut] means there that there is a need to review the impact of these changes to ensure that the plans remain affordable. So there is a slight hiatus. Once the review is completed, the Council Officer dealing with it will be in touch to talk about how the scheme will proceed, especially concerning the issues in which we have a particular interest such as the road safety audit of the proposed access arrangements and how to manage contractor parking and access during the build process.)

The Wolvercote Mill site

Outline approval was given by the Council for 190 houses on this site on December 1. There are a series of welcome conditions attached to the approval and John Bleach spoke at the Council meeting making a number of additional points. Our main additional points were that there should be provision for housing for elderly people, for key workers and some form of co-housing. There should be encouragement for the development to be carbon neutral, and there should be consultation with the existing community with regard to travel plans, the provision of community facilities, continued maintenance of the site and the mitigation of noise from the A34.

An issue which we know residents were particularly concerned about was flooding and the provision for adequate drainage. The 'Outline Surface Water Strategy' supporting the application was a 'conceptual design' only sufficient to support an outline application but it will need to be refined and developed at the full planning application .

The current position is that the University is in discussion with a developer but 'for reasons of commercial confidentiality' is not able to give further information. It is hoped that there will be an announcement before Christmas.

Northern Gateway

As I am sure you all know this site is now owned by companies for St John's College - and Savills are now acting for them in the production with planners of a master plan. We did make strenuous efforts to demonstrate the inappropriateness of a development , certainly one of this size ,on this site reflecting the views of residents but development was approved by the inspector and so what we have to do is work to make the development as acceptable as we can. Savills have been very willing to make efforts to engage the local community through contact with the Neighbourhood Forum and Roger Smith accepted an invitation to come to tell you where they have got to. Roger will be willing, I am sure, to answer a few questions but please remember that this is not a workshop or presentation about the Northern Gateway. During the break he will also be able to talk to you informally.

Before I ask Roger to speak may I ask if there are any matters arising from the minutes which I have not covered in my report and if you have any questions.

5. Progress of the Northern Gateway Development.

Roger Smith apologised that Rod Linnell, who was in charge of the planning for Savills was on holiday but said that if he were not able to answer questions he would take email addresses and respond with the answer. He said that the Northern Gateway site had been identified for development over 10 years ago and it was now established that it would be built so it was in our interests to work with the Plan. A planning application would be submitted in about April/May 2017. Revised proposals would address local concerns about traffic, pollution, noise, ecology etc. An Environmental Impact Assessment was part of the application

which comprised 500 dwellings, with 50% to be affordable and mixed tenure with 2500m retail/employment space and possibly a hotel. It was thought that St John's would be reluctant to dispose of the freehold because they may wish to retain a long-term interest in the site. Air quality was most affected near to the A34 and the planning application recognised that traffic is bad and it would seek "to ensure it is no worse than it already is". The outline planning application is for the whole site, a "hybrid". The first phase development was for housing, retail etc. Section 106 terms are still to be agreed on and it will be at least three years before anything happens. The Highways Authority will demand that infrastructure schemes and on site improvements are made in a phased approach before any extra traffic is generated.

Doug Parr said that it is important that the transport model conforms to what actually happens. i.e. how much traffic will actually be generated: how many cars in peak hours, how many people working on site or away – bus/walking/cycling. It must be agreed with the County Council how that is distributed – A34 or city-bound, and modelling the junctions that will be affected by traffic and traffic counts and modelling must be realistic. A question was asked about the link road and it was said by the Inspector and repeated by RS that the development was *not* dependent on the link road being built and there was no funding. It was also said at the exhibition at Jury's Inn that St John's would not want to start the Northern Gateway development before the link road is built. Cllr Jean Fooks said that there *was* funding. JF read from the recent **Strategic Economic Plan for Oxfordshire: there is a list of projects to be funded by Oxfordshire's City Deal money.** One of them is a scheme to support the regeneration of Oxford's Northern Gateway and the A40 approaches to Oxford. The following sentence caused concern: "The package will relieve congestion and deliver growth at the Northern Gateway development site, including 800 houses, of which 300 are additional to current plans, and up to 8,000 new jobs." JF said "The roundabouts scheme is the bit to reduce congestion - but this is the first time I have seen a reference to increasing the housing numbers from 500 to 800." This is a 300 increase from the 500 originally proposed and agreed in the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan, adopted by the City Council in July 2015 and built into the Thomas White Oxford proposals aired at the public exhibition in April 2016. This revised number is more than the number of households in Cutteslowe (775) and many more than in Lower Wolvercote (526). Even the representative of the developer (RS) seemed to be unaware of this new number. It was questioned how this had been missed in the consultation which apparently had taken place. GJ said that because of the housing situation it would be good to raise housing higher up on the list and make it a priority in phase one.

6. **Elections.** AG took the floor for the elections. There were three vacancies to be elected for a three-year term including the position of Secretary. The election is open to anyone living or working in the designated area and the Steering Committee can co-opt a member if required. CH appealed for a secretary to help with taking the minutes of meetings which otherwise would have to be shared around the Committee. He also required help with applying for grants to complete the Neighbourhood Plan. This needed to be done within six months and if successful the grant had to be spent within a time limit. No one came forward to stand for any of the positions except for Paul Buckley who AG introduced and invited him to speak about himself. Mr Buckley has lived in Lakeside for more than 20 years and has been closely involved in the railway issues associated with the new Chiltern Railways line. That issue had now come to an end and it was time for him to move on to other things including Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum. He was proposed by AG and seconded by DS and welcomed onto the Committee.

7. **The Treasurer's Report and Accounts 2015 – 2016.** The accounts had been audited by Neil Geddes, an independent examiner. A grant has been applied for to finance a consultant to help with the draft plan. This consultant had helped with Headington's Local Plan which was successfully accepted. GJ proposed and MB seconded that the accounts be approved.

8. **Any Other Business.** Notice was given that the Farmers' Market would be moving to the White Hart Wolvercote from Sunday 29th October. This was not entirely clear on the flyers handed out. The Good Neighbour Scheme also produced a leaflet which was available. CH thanked the Women's Institute for providing refreshments and cake. A container for donations for the hire fee for the hall was placed at the door.
9. The meeting was closed at 8.50 pm

Have your say!

Fri 6th Oct 6-8pm
Cutteslowe Pavilion

Wed 11th Oct 6-8pm
Wolvercote Baptist Hall



Come along to our events,
or take the online survey at
www.wolvercotenf.org.uk



Draft Wolvercote
Neighbourhood Plan
is ready for comment
and feedback

216
**Come and
tell us what
you think!**

**There are
many ways
to tell us.**

**What is the
future for
Wolvercote?**

Tue 31st Oct 7-9.30pm
Annual General Meeting
Wolvercote Village Hall

**Feedback Deadline
17th November**

You can also tell us what you think by:




wolvercotenf@gmail.com



facebook.com/wolvercote



141 Godstow Road
Wolvercote
OX2 8PG



See
www.wolvercotenf.org.uk



Draft Wolvercote Neighbourhood Plan

Here is a summary of some of the policies in the plan.

Heritage

Using Character Assessments to protect our local heritage.

The policies include:

- Emphasising local character
- Restricting infilling
- Enhancing Conservation Areas
- Protecting buildings and streets



Commerce

Supporting but controlling economic growth developments.

The policies include:

- Supporting existing business
- Providing transport links between employment areas
- Influencing Northern Gateway



Green Spaces & Biodiversity

Protecting and enhancing green space and biodiversity for residents' well-being.

The policies include:

- Maintaining publicly accessible green space
- Protecting allotments
- Enhancing play areas
- Encouraging biodiversity
- Increasing green space



Community, Transport & Health

Promoting and encouraging a vibrant and healthy community.

The policies include:

- More community and medical facilities
- Improved transport links
- Travel plan development
- Safe access routes




Built Environment

Making sure that buildings are designed sustainably, land used efficiently, & pollution minimised.

The policies include:

- Brownfield development
- Controlling pollution
- Developing design guidance
- Encouraging specialist housing
- Reducing flooding risk
- Discouraging demolition



Wolvercote's Draft Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Responses.

Public consultation on Wolvercote's Draft Neighbourhood Plan took place from 6th October 2017 until 17th November 2017. The public was able to make comments via an on-line survey, by email or by filling in paper copies of the survey that were available at the three consultation events held across the Neighbourhood Plan Area – the ward of Wolvercote.

Working together with the Project Manager the Steering Committee has reviewed all the consultation comments and has made some changes to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This new revision of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is available on the Neighbourhood Forum's website. <http://www.wolvercotenf.org.uk/the-plan/draft-plan/>

This report presents the unedited Specific Comments, the Project Manager's suggested change and the Steering Committee's response (where changes to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan are noted).

The feedback and consultation comments fell broadly into the following categories:

- Positive feedback on the work undertaken to prepare the Neighbourhood Plan (thanks – it keeps us motivated!)
- Comments that reinforced the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan
- Comments that related to policies or issues that are outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan
- Comments that warranted some revision of the Plan
- Comments where the small number did not warrant a revision of the Plan

Table of Contents

Green Spaces and Biodiversity.....	3
Built Environment.....	8
Commerce.....	18
Community, Transport and Health	20
Heritage	25
General Comments	27
Satisfaction with Wolvercote’s Draft Neighbourhood Plan	29

Green Spaces and Biodiversity

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
GBS2	It's most important to preserve the integrity of the Green Belt round Oxford.	None	Noted
General	They look good.	None	Noted
GBS5 and GBC1	I fully support the need to sustain and promote green spaces and biodiversity. Maintaining wildlife corridors is particularly important, including in runs of domestic gardens. These are at risk from infill developments.	None	Added sentence to GBS5.
General	Ban the use of glyphosate (as well as neonics).	Noted. Outside the scope of NPs	Noted
GBS5	Policy GB55 Destruction of habitats should be resisted	None	Noted
220 GBS1 and GBS2	I agree with the policies to preserve existing open spaces and amenity. In addition I would like to see proactive policies to add to and improve space, and not just preserve what is there. Like the Greenbelt, we all know that some day there will be pressure to erode protected space, like the liberal disregard of Greenbelt land around the Northern gateway, and this might be prevented in future with policies for active community involvement in such space.	GBS6 is a proactive policy to increase green space in developments, as is GBC4. No suggested changes.	Introduction to GB policies refers to the involvement of the community in decisions on the use of public open space.
GBS2, GBS4 and GBC5	I very much approve of these: thank you. I especially note with gratitude the mention of allotments and of existing private gardens as important elements, as well as the green belt and its margins.	None	Noted
GBS1	Essential – maintenance of existing green spaces and areas.	One of the roles of OCC, although WNF could consider the role they might play.	GBS6 refers to developers being responsible for the maintenance of measures to increase biodiversity on sites.
GBS1 and GBS2	I strongly disagree with any planning permission to build on the North Oxford Golf course. It provides important leisure and health option for existing residents and new residents to further housing development in the area. It also acts as a green barrier/oasis to break up housing density and maintains habitat for previous wildlife.	None.	Noted

GBS3 and CHC1	Adequate children's play areas, sports areas, although Cutteslowe Park has much of these and should be used a main hub for sport to maximise its use and create a community core to focus funding and labour on for all to share and use as a social network including use of Cutteslowe Pavilions for meetings and groups, the cafe, etc.	None.	Noted
GBS6	Consideration of adequate trees and foliage in new areas and space for dog walking.	None	GBC1 refers to tree planting and verges
GBS2	Is there a typo in the section "Areas of green belt form are also very important"? The second sentence is not very meaningful or robust ie what does it mean by care must be taken? The section which reads "which could gradually be lost to development." is ambiguous. Does it mean that the Green Belt could be lost to development or does it meant that the edges of the Green Belt could be lost to development - in which case what are "the edges of the Green Belt"?	Noted – the supporting text needs to be checked and clarified.	Text checked and clarified
221 GBS5	As is recognised elsewhere in the draft plan, it is important to have wildlife corridors rather than isolated sections of land for biodiversity. Could this section be expanded to reflect this fact and seek for it to be taken into consideration in situations where a developer is seeking to provide a replacement habitat elsewhere?	Noted – the supporting text can be reviewed to ensure that where replacement habitat is provided elsewhere, that corridors are considered.	Done - added sentence to text and GBS 5
GBS6	This is an extract from page 16: "Designs for new developments should try to include a mix of private and public open space of at least 15% of the total area of the development. More than 50% of that should be green space, designed and if possible planted to ensure the protection of wildlife corridors and biodiversity (see GBS5)." I appreciate that it is difficult to be prescriptive but elsewhere in the draft plan words like "should" and "must" are used. Using words like "try" and "if possible" are invitations for the guidance to just be ignored by developers. Would it be possible to make this guidance as robust as possible?	Noted – OCC have their own space requirements – the WNF requirements go beyond this, and because they cannot be supported through evidence, are effectively aspirational, hence the language.	Noted

GBC4	<p>Page 18, Policy GBC4 – New designated local green spaces: Thank you for seeking to designate Cutteslowe & Sunnymead Park a Local Green Space. (Please note it should be Park not Parks as this is one park). Do you think it would be worth adding in a sentence to describe what this designation means? For example "Local Green Space designation is a way to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities." Also do you think that you need to acknowledge in this section that only part of Cutteslowe & Sunnymead Park falls into the Wolvercote Ward?</p>	Noted – suggested that these additions and clarifications can be made.	Text suitably amended and clarified.
222 GBS3	<p>I applaud the idea that not only Five Mile Drive recreation ground but also OUP sportsground should remain public amenities and be protected from development. Within the triangle between the ring road and Banbury Road we have no other facility of any kind than Five Mile Drive recreation ground and it is a vital part of our part of Wolvercote. I think it should be focused more than it is what on the needs of nearby residents (it is currently almost entirely dominated by pitches for Summertown Stars and the demographic of this part of Wolvercote is relatively older than that). Incorporation of OUP playing field into the FMD Rec would have a hugely beneficial effect in this regard. At present there is no pavilion or community building of any kind and possibly incorporating OUP playing fields would also resolve that issue.</p>	Noted – possible community projects might be considered from the comments provided?	Add to list of community projects
GBS2	<p>to forbid all GB developments is not necessarily wise – some non- SSSI sites , of modest visual or amenity value , could well be considered for development eg Northern Gateway . Plans could insist on extra non- GB land being re-designated as in Cambridge – where GB land actually increased in area .</p>	Noted – to be considered by WNF	Noted
GBS3	<p>part of the OUP sports ground could be used for housing , with the retention of the cricket pitch and pavilion [to be used as a community centre] .</p>	Noted – although this may be at odds with other comments – something for WNF to consider.	Discussed by SC - at odds with other policies
GBS3	<p>Wolvercote Cemetery cannot be extended west – the water table is too high for coffin security !</p>	Noted – does this change the text on GBS3?	Text has changed, but not mentioned water table
GBC3	<p>Concern about water courses and associated land. ‘More information needed’ (I take it this means keeping them clear should be mentioned.) Will the river and the canal be dredged.?</p>	Noted – Some further explanatory text for this section should be included	Text expanded

General	More tree planting needed to replace felled trees for construction. (Is this not strong enough?)	Noted – the City Council already have a tree management policy - The overall aim of the tree policy is to ensure that Oxford's tree stock is retained, enhanced and increased in the most proactive manner whilst ensuring the health, safety and well being of the public and property.	Tree planting is encouraged both in GBS5 and GBC1
223 GBS5, GBS2	Strong defence of common land and SSSI. Large developments should provide protection for SSSI etc. Firmer statements needed to protect land from land use change	Noted – although the current policies seek to protect this land from development. Forum to note whether stronger protection is needed?	Added note about protection from pollution to GBS2
GBS1	Some policies too woolly want things generally stronger eg. Remove 'unless' from GBS1.	Noted – removing the word 'unless' will probably lead to the policy being in non-conformity with the NPPF and Local Plan. NP policies should not be designed to stop proposed development.	Noted

GBS1, GBS5	Objective criteria to assess and replace any loss of Green Space. Firm requirement that there should always be a net gain in biodiversity	Noted – GBS1 already has objective criteria for the replacement of green space (size and amenity). In relation to biodiversity, a net gain is relatively meaningless. One extra organism is a net gain. More reasonable to expect parity.	GBS5 has been added to re aim to increase biodiversity
GBS2	Concern to protect Green Belt. Fear that OCC will try to over ride Green Belt protection.	Noted. =	Noted

Built Environment

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
BES9	Can we not say that there should be no building AT ALL on land liable to flooding? - not given certain conditions because developers will always get round them. Overall I like the ideas expressed but I wonder whether they are emphasised strongly enough - too much "encourage" things rather than enforcing them.	There is a system of dealing with flood risk – it would be difficult for the NP to override this – and the role of the Environment Agency.	Agreed desirable but outside of scope of NP - no action
225 BES3	I would also like to see more discussion on noise pollution and its degrading effects on public open spaces as well as homes and gardens. It became very apparent in recent battles with Chiltern Rail, Network Rail and Oxford City Council that protection of private property is a secondary consideration to the easing of bureaucracy, budgets and "up/down" thinking - thought processes limited to business and budget considerations rather than the populations which in theory the public bodies are supposed to serve. Wolvercote Common would be a more tranquil place without the A34 traffic noise pollution, and we should expect that to change.	Policy BES3 does attempt to deal with this issue, although WNF may want to revisit the policy?	Policy amended within scope of NP, i.e. to relate to specific new development.
BES2	Monitoring and elimination of air pollution should be high on the agenda.	BES2 is a strategic policy.	Policy amended
BES6	Diversity of housing is important in any new development.	OCC has a Mix of Dwellings policy which WNF is looking to enhance.	Policy amended
BES8	Synchronize development in tandem with provision on appropriate improvement of infrastructure.	Policy BES8 deals with this issue.	Already incorporated. No further action

General	The policies are sensible. In particular on the heights of buildings, reduction of noise and air pollution, and maintaining a good mix of homes at densities no greater than at present. Developers need to be held to their commitments.	None	Already incorporated. No further action
226 BES2	I agree with the policies around air pollution. I believe that our thinking on this subject is too limited however, since plan policies seem to be biased largely to monitoring traffic generated by the need to travel to work and so on. I believe that more attention should be given to changing our work patterns to reduce the need to travel at all, as well as making public transport more accessible. With joined up thinking, we already have the technology to allow home or local working for a large number of people. There are examples of towns and cities which have built in community needs from shops to symphony orchestras, and reduced needs to constantly travel. Oxford is a prime example of a demand for walking and cycling. The huge amount of road traffic could be avoided by preventing Oxford increasingly being promoted as a commuter base for London workers, or a work centre for Oxfordshire town and village workers. We daily export vast numbers to London and import vast numbers to work here. A clear long term strategy on working practices could solve this.	Noted – issues raised have wider and more strategic requirements than can be provided in NP. Although other CTH section policies on transport seek to mitigate against increasing traffic flows.	Agreed desirable but outside of scope of NP - no action

BES1, BES4 and BES5	On demolition, we have local house developers like Gomm who are regularly getting permission from Oxford City Council to demolish houses and rebuild. In Blenheim Drive the OCC ignored 60 objections to such a development, the development went ahead and has now set a convenient precedent to the Council to allow through all similar applications. This erodes the character of an area, is against the wishes of the local residents, and suggests a total disconnect between the Council and its resident population. Residents feel disenfranchised, resigned and less likely to engage in community initiatives. This sentiment flows through into design, which too often is bland and out of context with the neighbourhood, a homogenisation of our environment. If Policy BE5 changes this, great, but it would suggest a sea change from the Council's existing attitude and approach. Ditto with Policy BE1.	Noted – cited policies intend to deal with the issues raised.	Already incorporated. No further action
227 BEC4	BEC4 sounds great, but Oxford City Council are known to be very weak on enforcement where it matters most to residents. Enforcement should extend to the Council being enforced to apply enforcement policies where appropriate.	Noted – the NP cannot enforce LPAs actions, but is attempting to encourage the LPAs to use their powers appropriately.	Already incorporated. No further action
BEC5	BEC5 smart homes - sounds good but this should become part of a wider strategy having regard to the high sophistication of smart city development and the need for smart homes to be capable of linking to local grid systems. It is easy to see smart home tech becoming quickly obsolete.	Noted - issues raised have wider and more strategic requirements than can be provided in NP.	Wider strategy is outside of scope of NP - no action
General	I agree with all that's been proposed.	None	

BES4	<p>Strongly disagree with Policy BES4 on demolition. If housing policy is not to build on Green Belt land nor to give up garden space (which I support for environmental amenity reasons) then that means that the existing development footprint needs to become denser, and therefore higher to support a greater number of households. Moreover, many of the older buildings in the area are probably highly energy inefficient, are not well suited to the needs of modern and future society (cycle storage, electric cars etc), and may not be well designed to cope with potential flooding. I see no amenity value in the post-war housing stock referred to in the policy, and the WNP should not stand in the way of their demolition in place of buildings that better meet the needs of current and future generations. I do however, support the proposal to stimulate diversity of new housing stock.</p>	<p>Noted - Policy BES4 is not stopping demolition per se, but ensuring that demolition does not happen as the primary stage of redevelopment. Properties can be upgraded without demolition, and density can be increased through sympathetically designed additions.</p>	<p>BES4 is as much about sustainable use of existing building stock as about the character of the built environment, where it also favours diversity. The NP aims to preserve the character of urban areas and not to discriminate between styles from different historical periods. Policy amended</p>
228 General	<p>In terms of other policies, there is a clear need for infrastructure planning in this area to improve public transport, cycling, schools, and reduce road congestion. This must come BEFORE the Northern Gateway or any other development is considered in or around the area. The WNP should not support any housing or commercial development until this is enacted.</p>	<p>Noted – although improvement in infrastructure is often linked to developer funding related to these developments. Ideally funding would be made available prior to developments, but this does not happen. WNF needs to influence both the developments which come through applications, and</p>	<p>Agreed, but outside scope of NP - no action</p>

		the need for infrastructure.	
BES3	The discussion of pollution very wisely includes noise as an important problem (p.11). Any large-scale planning in the Wolvercote area should aim to reduce the present noise levels. This, like cleaner air, would be a significant health benefit to aim for.	None	Already incorporated. No further action
BES2	Ensure guidance on promximity to busy roads for housing is adhered to in relation to harmful health impacts.	None	Agreed. No further action.
BES5	Attention to overall views and perspective across the landscape and limited height of buildings to ensure everyone has opportunity to not feel overlooked or to have any views obscured to countryside (gaps between buildings etc.)	None	Already incorporated. Individual privacy and views of development from across countryside has been prioritized over views of the countryside from within developments, which are difficult to plan to suit everyone.
229 BES2	Page 11, point 11: The whole of Oxford City has been identified as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) because of the levels of nitrogen dioxide. Cutteslowe Roundabout and the Wolvercote Roundabout have been identified as localised Air Quality (AQ) hotspots where levels of nitrogen dioxide exceed target levels. Could the statement in respect of both of these roundabouts be made more robust?	Noted – proposed that supporting text for BES2 needs to be improved.	Done
BES3	Page 20, Policy BES3 - Noise Pollution: Should be "VAT" not "vat"!	Noted and will be changed.	Done

BES2	I also applaud the idea of preventing development in areas which do not meet the air quality standards (it would include part of Northern Gateway I think). It does not make sense when we have a health crisis induced by traffic pollution to build close to the main roads and roundabouts that are creating much of the pollution. This would not only increase the number of people exposed to harmful emissions but also generate even more congestion and hence higher pollution levels. I would also suggest some encouragement of the planting of roadside trees and bushes should be incorporated. This is shown to improve air quality as well as the visual contribution to the area.	Noted – Potential planting project could be included in Community Projects?	A 2012 study has shown that planting vegetation to reduce air pollution can be most effective in "urban street canyons" https://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/pressroom/presspacs/2012/acs-presspac-august-29-2012/green-plants-reduce-pollution-on-city-streets-up-to-eight-times-more-than-previously-believed.html This suggests that planting should be one of a number of interrelated measures that need to be considered by the designers at the outset of any project.
230 BES2	I note that Wolvercote and Banbury road roundabouts are areas of high pollution As far as Wolvercote roundabout is concerned , surely with the developement of the Northern Gateway , this will acerbate this problem. There is one outstanding feature that proves how bad this area is . If any of the committee wishes to view the roof of Manor Farmhouse , this was newly constructed with Golden Cotswold tiles about four or five years ago , they are now BLACK .	Noted – Policy BES2 is proposed to control development until air quality problems are better managed.	Already incorporated. No further action
BES5	With reference to house design , I am sure the committee will agree that garages were originally designed to contain cars , now days they are furniture depositories or whatever . These should be designed as car ports , where it is not too much trouble for residents to drive straight in rather than park on the road. A notable design in Monks Risbro,Bucks, of mixed style housing no-one is allowed too leave their cars on the road , They have to park in the garage or on the drive leading up to the house . This not only makes good sense , but is safe for pedestrians and has a very attractive appearance.	Noted – no proposed changes but for Working Group to consider.	Agreed that off-street parking should be incorporated where possible, whether in the form of hardstandings, carports or even garages, however space could be limited (eg for cars belonging to residents of flats) and car-parking zones would be needed to control on-street parking, essential for visitors. Dwellings on stilts with parking under is one solution. (At the same time it would provide protection from flooding.)
BES5	T>V Ariels . They too should be integral to new builds .I notice you have included arrangements for bins .These have become a plight on all streets .	None	Already incorporated. No further action

General	Energy and Resource Allocation--- could mention that factory structured buildings are much better built , energy efficient ,and better for workers.	None	Agreed, but outside scope of NP - no action
BE Spatial Policies	BE Spatial Policies --- to prevent ' urban sprawl ' altogether is to prevent extra housing [including affordable] within easy public -- transport distance of jobs . Not an entirely well considered policy , and it is going to happen anyway . Do we want the City to ignore our better - considered suggestions ?	Noted – preventing 'urban sprawl' does not prevent extra housing within easy reach – it is about correctly managing the development of new housing and transport infrastructure.	Wording of supporting text changed: "tightly controlled" instead of "prevented".
231 BES2	not permitting any dwellings on high – pollution sites – Northern Gateway would not have any flats or houses . Total house ventilation – filtered against pollution – protects people in the environment in which they spend most of their time – not only against air pollution , but traffic / train noise too.	Noted – although WNF needs to consider current residents as well as new residents, and also new residents when outside of properties.	People should not be inhibited by air or noise pollution when they wish to spend time outside of their homes in gardens or on balconies. Mechanical ventilation only works if the filters are kept clean and there is little certainty that residents will do this. Therefore no further action.
BEC5	factory structured dwellings are much better built , durable ,faster to build , energy efficient [higher construction tolerances] and better for construction workers . It is also much easier to incorporate ' smart house' facilities .	Noted – consideration for developers as policies do not preclude the use of factory structures dwellings.	Agreed in principle, but in the interest of diversity, we would not wish to dictate building methods to developers - no action
BES6	Essential planning permission should be granted first and foremost for plans for housing that meet the highest need – to reduce the Council's housing list. Cutteslowe and Wolvercote have historically had large areas of affordable and supported and maintained social rented property. Since the Government sell of of council property there is urgent need to replace and extend this stock to meet the current need.	Noted – although this is not the way the planning system works – all planning applications must be considered in good time by the LPA.	Agreed, but NPs are unable to prioritize - no action.

BES7	Consideration for keyworker housing as a priority and support public service staffing in the city which support not only the region, but the nation. This needs to be here to balance other building development e.g. Barton and Westgate, where there is no such provision.	None	Agreed. Barton and Westgate developments were agreed before Council reviewed their policy on keyworker housing. No action.
BES2	With current research as a guide residential property needs to be set back from busy roads to prevent known negative impacts of fumes.	Policy BES2 provides a policy approach to dealing with air pollution. Setting houses back from roads does not mitigate from chronic air pollution.	Disagree with PM's comment. Distance of dwellings from busy roads may affect air quality, subject to the form of the new buildings. Already covered in BES2.
BES1	Concern about re-designation of sites once green fields as development sites- e.g. N. Gateway.	Noted – although there is a strict definition of brownfield development	Agreed
232 BES3	Complaint that there is nothing about existing noise pollution from A34 and railway. It only addresses protecting new developments. Barriers are needed.	Noted – although NPs only deal with new development. Dealing with existing noise sources, especially outside the Plan Area, would be an unreasonable expectation of the Plan.	We can only aim to protect new developments, though measures could have spin-off effects for existing residents. No action.
BES2	Air quality already poor and will be increased by the traffic generated by development.	Noted – which is why BES2 seeks to control development where Air Quality is poor.	Already incorporated. No further action

BES5	Building height should be limited to three stories in a residential area.	Noted – this is in BES5	Already incorporated. No further action
BES5	Buildings should be limited to 2 stories	Given that many properties in the Plan Area are already 3 stories, this would be considered as unreasonable.	As PM comment
General	Why no mention of the Mill site development since it will mean an increase in traffic , parking pollution?	Noted – the Mill site already has planning consent, and therefore will not be controlled by any Planning Policies within the WNP.	As PM comment
General	Roads in developments should not 'link as through roads' to prevent rat runs.	Noted – although this is not going to be reasonable or possible in all instances. For the Forum to consider whether they want to adopt this issue.	Agreed, good idea
BES1	Brownfield sites should be used first unless there is a good reason to build on green land.	Noted – Policy BES1 seeks to do this – and guide development o brownfield land. Note that the NP cannot stop development taking place.	Already incorporated. No further action

BES2	BES 2. re Air Pollution should apply to commercial and industrial development too.	Noted – although these premises are not considered to be as sensitive receptors as residential.	Agreed in principle, but the first priority should be to protect those who have to be at home, such as mothers and young children. No Action
BES2	There should be no development until pollution levels are acceptable.	Noted – Policy BES2 seeks to control development where air quality is poor.	Already incorporated. No further action
BES3	BES3 What about the railway?	This policy includes noise from all sources.	Already incorporated. No further action
BES4 – 7	Support for BES 4- BES 7	None	No further action

Commerce

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
General	Farmers Mkt - have on Saturday? Appears to be overwhelmed by Summertown market.	None	Not relevant as such to plan
General	The must be local consultation on plans.	This may relate to planning applications and the need for local input. There is already local input through Councillors, and BEC1 identifies need for more community involvement.	Agreed on Suggested Change, which means no change.
235 General	The great number (over 250) is a concern as access in the local area by car is already very difficult. Working from home can mean more traffic, deliveries, people coming in for meetings, etc. The roads can't cope with more cars.	This may relate to businesses based from homes. No suggestion for changes.	Acknowledge comment but not appropriate or possible to include anything in plan policies.
COC1	We have limited commercial activity, which needs nurturing. The pubs are a real asset. The post office and post box both are useful, and we need more of them. For those of us between the Woodstock and Banbury Roads, Summertown provides our main commercial centre, and even that is losing diversity given the numbers of estate agents and for some reason, kitchen shops.	None	This is an acknowledgement of what is covered already by the existing policies.
COC2	Many more people would cycle if they felt confident. Many motorists dislike cyclists and can be aggressive towards them. So more cycle lanes and also more awareness of highway codes and good practice needed to make policies work better. Wolvercote is connected to Woodstock Road and the City by bus, but not directly to Summertown (shops and employment), the two railway stations, the hospitals and so on. Here is an opportunity for fewer cars if we had a more joined up public transport network. Maybe a City Hopper bus that would easily get people to relevant destinations would make a big difference.	Policy COC2 may be better integrated within the Community, Transport and Health section of policies.	Note the comments which are more relevant to transport policies but I believe we have covered this adequately.

COC1	While opening up of opportunities for new commerce would enhance the opportunity for new jobs and services, all efforts should be made to nurture and support as a priority existing retail and commerce in the area. Maintenance of local existing shops should not be threatened by planning permission to unnecessary new or large concerns that would threaten these valued, local resources (including Post Offices)	Policy COC1 considers existing businesses.	Agree with Suggested Changes that concern is covered already.
COC2	Consideration of walking distance, mobility scooter and pushchair accessibility (and wheelchair) and provision of adjacent parking for their use.	Noted – something for WNF to consider any changes.	Difficult to include, as much depends on availability of suitable properties and on market forces. Access issue for those with particular challenges could be considered but, in practice, appropriate parking spaces have to be allocated in new developments.
General	Concern that there should be no commercial development on Mill site.	Noted – although Planning Consent has already been granted for this site.	Agree with Suggested Change, which means no change. Allowance for some workshops or offices, which may or may not happen.
236 COC1	Protection of small local shops against large commercial organisations – would like lower Council tax and subsidised rents etc.	Noted – outside the remit of the Plan.	Agree with Suggested Change, which means no change.

Community, Transport and Health

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
CHS6	I think there should be mention of car free developments and car sharing. I'm not sure where the nearest car pool is but perhaps there should be one in Wolvercote.	Car-free developments have been mentioned in Policy CHS6 in relation to Travel Plans, although WNF may want to consider whether this can be strengthened.	Policy CHS6 clause 2 is strong enough to meet this point
237 General and CHS1	In addition to the policies set out (which seem reasonable), some consideration should go towards how access to green space in the plan area and in connecting areas can be improved. For example, a foot and cycle bridge over the railway near the Plough. A cycle path across Port Meadow from North-South to allow better access to Jericho. An off-road foot/cycle path to connect Wolvercote/Godstow with Wytham.	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Policy CHC2 expanded to be more proactive and cover this point
General	Traffic speed - apply "20 is plenty" signs??	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	White Hart playground - needs updating, wood falling apart.	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan

General	Bus stop - litter bin blocks pram access along pavement	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	Church lane cycle barrier - too narrow for prams, ours doesn't fit thru	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	Foot bridges - more foot bridges crossing train line and canal from port Meadow R. Thames- more foot bridges crossing river around Wolvercote stretch	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Policy CHC2 expanded to be more proactive and cover this point
General	Recycling truck - too squeaky and very loud	Noted. Outside the scope of NPs	Outside the scope. Item needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority
General	Dak Bo - community Cafe/kitchen? (Nb: I am a chef!)	WNF may want to consider whether any of these ideas could be included as specific community policies?	Item that needs to be referred for action by the relevant authority - not appropriate for inclusion in a 15 year Neighbourhood Plan
General	Deliveroo - reasons why they don't deliver to Wolvercote, when I see their cyclists passing thru?	Noted. Outside the scope of NPs	Outside the scope

CHS4 and CHC2	Important to have safe and separated footpaths and cycleways. Developers must pay for relevant upgrading of services.	Policies CHS4 and CHC2 deals with cycleways, although it is difficult to get developer funding in small developments to pay for upgrading of this infrastructure away from the development.	Policy CHC2 expanded to be more proactive and cover this point
CHS2	The wait to see a GP in the local area is often weeks, any substantial increase in housing would need to necessitate a commiserate increase in GP's and other health personell and facilities.	Policy CHS2 deals with the need for enhanced health facilities.	See policy CHS2
259 CHS4 and CHC2	I am concerned that the 100 or more criteria for requiring support for these policies could promote developments of 99 homes. But I realise that the number might come from some general standard practice. I am keen on developing cycle paths that are well designed and clearly marked, to protect pedestrians from cyclists as much as cyclists from motorised traffic.	None	First point noted. See CHS4 and CHC2
CHS1, CHS4 and CHS6	I wholly agree with the aim of reducing "dependence on cars" (pp.27-8) and the importance of really planning for walking and cycling as a serious form of practical transport.	None	Point agreed, no action required
CHS1	Ensure the provision of new routes in addition to the excellent bus routes in the area, so that they take in the distance from new properties to bus stops.	None	Outside the scope of a NP
CHS2	The provision of dental and GP services is essential to meet the increase in demand and ensure the existing population is not adversely affected in access to these services by the rise in population.	Medical facilities is dealt with by CHS2. What about dental facilities?	Dental facilities added to CHS2
General	Our community could develop a very beneficial social organisation to improve the quality of life and life expectancy of its repetitively older members through greater social interaction and mutual support. However at present there is no forum for this within practical walking distance (particularly older members are discouraged by the very busy main roads and roundabouts).	Noted – possible community projects might be considered from the comments provided?	Community venues are the subject of policy CHC1

General	The relief road for the A40/ A34 link should be a pre-requisite before any development takes place.	Noted – although improvement in infrastructure is often linked to developer funding related to these developments. Ideally funding would be made available prior to developments, but this does not happen. WNF needs to influence both the developments which come through applications, and the need for infrastructure.	This specific point has been made by WNF in relation to the Northern Gateway development but infrastructure has to be tackled in more general terms in the NP
240 CHS2	I email as one of the GPs working at Summertown Health Centre. As you know, we have branch surgeries in Wolvercote and Cutteslowe. I have only skimmed this draft plan, but I couldn't see any references to the need for more space for provision of primary care services. Perhaps I have missed it? With such a big expansion in population, our already overstretched surgeries will be under even more pressure. We will desperately need more space and better buildings to provide 21st century primary care to our population.	Policy CHS2 deals with the need for enhanced health facilities.	See policy CHS2
CH6	Developers may well have to subsidise public transport medium / long term .	None	Outside the scope of a NP
CHC2	More support for cycling.	Noted – Policy CHC2 provides for more cycling infrastructure.	See policy CHC2
General	Concern about more congestion with N. Gateway	Noted – general CTH policies aim to reduce car use and associated congestion in Plan Area.	supportive comment, a view we share. Noted.

General	One respondent was very concerned about the use of water power solar panels etc. to make Wolvercote as near as possible electrically independent.	Noted – do WNF want to consider encouraging this type of development?	For consideration - not this section of the plan.
General	Roads are already over capacity and there is no mention of improving the road system. This to many is the MOST IMPORTANT issue.	Noted – although improving the road system substantially within the constraints of the Plan Area is challenging. Through development the Plan seeks to improve transport infrastructure in general.	Supports a view we share. Noted.
241 General	Very specific concern about cycle access to Parkway station to discourage driving there.	Noted – Policy CHC2 provides for more cycling infrastructure.	See policy CHC2
CHS4	Concern about provision of Schools and about safe access to schools.	Noted – Safe access is set out in CHS4	See policy CHS4
CHS2 and CHS4	Provision of Health Centre facilities and access to them esp. for the elderly	Noted – Policies CHS2 and CHS4 cover these areas.	See policies CHS2 and CHS4
CHS2	CHS2 Concern that developers will not fund improvements in facilities esp. medical facilities.	Noted – WNF has this concern too – which is why the Plan has identified these Policies.	Comment supports a concern we share. Noted.

Heritage

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
General	Developments must be of an appropriate scale. Conservation areas must be nurtured . "Explore the historic legacy of Wolvercote" sounds worthwhile.	None	Covered already but a very small amendment included to cover.
General	Heritage in this local area means implies a gradual increase in the number of houses not a massive, sudden growth. I believe the process, in terms of time, should also be included in heritage criteria before any large scale housing developments are considered.	NP policies are reactive to Planning Applications, and as such cannot influence the timing of submissions. However, WNF notes the need for managed and controlled change in terms of timing.	Considered but we cannot prevent developments like the Mill site and Northern Gateway as they already have various forms of permissions.
General	Entirely laudable.	None	No need for change
HEC2	The conservation area should include the 19th C cottages called Cyprus Terrace which are a row (1-9) leading off St Peter's Road.	Noted – for WNF to consider change.	Covered adequately by policy. Certainly suggestion should be considered.
HEC3	Wolvercote Local History Society should be included in those the Plan needs to work with. As a local historian and writer of books on Wolvercote I am of course interested in being consulted about its history.	Noted – for WNF to consider change.	We have the Treasurer of the WLHS as our chairman so we have a good avenue of communication.
HES2	I wholly agree with these. (I'm not sure if this next point belongs here, but the form doesn't allow one to back-track...) I especially agree with the 'aim' that mentions a "strict limit on infilling" (p.10). In all, it's an excellent proposal, and I feel most grateful to all those who have worked hard to produce it.	None	No need for change

HES2	Disagree with policy HES2 for the reasons stated above in the section on Built Environment. Opportunities for a denser and more modern housing footprint should be welcomed, as long as they do not result in greater flood risk by creating too much hard surfacing without equivalent compensation/mitigation.	This refers to the objection to BES4. Policy HES2 does not restrict infilling per se, but encourages appropriately scaled and designed infilling.	Have made an amendment, adding words "while providing opportunities for more housing", which rightly shows concern while safeguarding sensitive locations.
HEC1	The maintenance of valued historical stock and properties representing different periods of build and design.	None	Have added word "maintenance" to policy.
HES1, HEC2	Sympathetic new building and design to fit in with current stock.	None	Agree with Suggested changes, meaning no change.
HES1	With the proposed development of the Northern Gateway, I note no mention has been made of Jo. White, Lane. This would be a great loss of a lovely rural feeling to the area.	Noted – for WNF to consider change.	Agree with concern expressed but believe covered by policy, which does not specify particular locations. Something also added in preamble to help set overall theme.
General	General strong support for policies.	Noted.	No need for change
HES2 and HEC1	One respondent commented HES2 should be stronger and that HEC1 should be sensible- e.g. insulation etc should be permitted as long as the character is not adversely affected.	Noted – for Forum to consider whether HES2 is appropriate. HEC1 does not stop insulation being fitted.	Have strengthened policy but agree with Suggested Changes about insulation.

General Comments

Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Suggested Change	Steering Committee response
General	Thank you to those who have put in so much time to preparing the plan.	None	Already covered, no action
General	Oxford Preservation Trust recognises the time and effort that has been put in to the preparation of this plan and look forward to continuing to work Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum them going forward.	None	Already covered, no action
General	My only general comment is that I support the draft document.	None	Already covered, no action
General	Many thanks for all the hard work!	None	Already covered, no action
General	Just a huge thanks to everyone for all their work putting this together for us	None	Already covered, no action
General	Hi - I've just read through the Draft Plan and it seems to be a very comprehensive document. Well done everyone involved. Overall I like the ideas expressed but I wonder whether they are emphasised strongly enough - too much "encourage" things rather than enforcing them. Thanks to everyone for doing this	None	A thorough review of the whole Plan has been undertaken by the Project Manager to ensure that the Policies are enforceable
General	Agree with policies 2, 4 and 6 on page 10 in particular. (Note paper form was filled in at AGM)	None	Already covered, no action
General	I would like to see ways to give local residents faith in the implication of plan policies, against a background of mistrust in the City Council based on poor support in the past. greater belief would lead to greater backing and that might help the community get more respect from the City Council.	None	We are working with other Oxford Neighbourhood Forums and Oxford City Council to ensure the adoption of our Policies once the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted
General	I put my general comments under 'Heritage', but just in case that doesn't work I shall say again that I feel most grateful for the hard work and commitment of those who have created this plan. It's very well thought out and very clearly presented.	None	Already covered, no action

General	I would like to sincerely thank everyone at the WNF who has worked on this draft plan. I know it has been challenging and there have been many important distractions along the way. It has required real commitment to get this far and I am very grateful to you all.	None	Already covered, no action
General	Congratulations on a very interesting and most informing details for the proposed future of the Wolvercote Ward .	None	Already covered, no action
Range of Issues	I wrote comments on the form at Farmers Market, abut in case this is enough I am strongly in support of the Neighbourhood Plan. Empahsis on air quality, drainage, and traffic is particularly welcome. I would only suggest that off-street parking should be encouraged rather than discouraged, PROVIDED standing is permeable. I do worry that the plan will have little impact, however.	Noted – Off-street parking has not been discouraged but paving over of front gardens for parking has been.	Already covered, no action
245 Logo	Many congratulations on the comprehensive WNF plan. Much work has obviously gone into this, and those involved should be heartily thanked. I have no substantive comments on the draft, but one small point about clarity is perhaps worth raising. The coloured logo is splendid, and an excellent idea. But I am confused by the text where it refers to the logo. On page 27 it states: "In Wolvercote Ward there are 5 geographically separate areas immediately identifiable as distinct and having different characteristics (see segments of the WNF logo)." And on page 31: "We have identified 5 distinct areas (Lower Wolvercote, Upper Wolvercote with the Woodstock Road Area, the Lakes, Jordan Hill, Templar Road Area) within Wolvercote." But the latter description of the areas seems not to correspond to the 5 different coloured areas on the logo. I also wonder why this refers to the "Templar Road Area", rather than "Cutteslowe". The latter makes clear that both the residential area and adjacent park are relevant.	Noted – issue for WNF to consider.	Thanks for drawing our attention to this, we have revised the wording.
General	The document as a whole , I think , reads was well considered – thanks to all concerned .	None	Already covered, no action

General	I received a copy of the WNF plan via the Harbord Road Residents Association, as I live in Cutteslowe. I fully agree with the plan and commend whoever wrote it for the clarity and depth of the document. I have one question - what authority does this document have ? It appears to be an extraordinarily well-crafted set of aspirations. If they are only aspirations, though, I think we can be sure that they will be ignored by council, developers and everyone else who can profit from development activity.... so, do we as a group have any powers to make these wishes into hard facts (hard demands or constraints, actually) ?	Responded.	We are working with other Oxford Neighbourhood Forums and Oxford City Council to ensure the adoption of our Policies once the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted
Housing (Similar comment in BE)	Who needs housing most from existing housing lots and to support essential staff for the services in Oxford City that support City, County and wider National Populations (health, academic, police, tourist and retail outlets, transport staff, council staff, refuse collection staff, etc. etc. Build to meet this need first. North Oxford already has a huge stock of housing of high value that is not affordable for key workers.	Policy BES7 responds to this issue.	Already covered, no action

Satisfaction with Wolvercote's Draft Neighbourhood Plan

What is your view of the draft Neighbourhood Plan overall?

Response	Count	%
Very much agree with it	7	53.8%
Broadly agree with it	6	46.2%
Neither agree or disagree with it	0	
Broadly disagree with it	0	
Very much disagree with it	0	
Total	13	

Sadie Paige
23/3/18

Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum Statutory Consultation Bodies (contact details where identified through email)

Local Authority Related:

Oxford City Council – planningpolicy@oxford.gov.uk
Oxfordshire County Council – linda.currie@oxfordshire.gov.uk
Cherwell District Council – planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Summertown Neighbourhood Forum – sampc.clarke@gmail.com
Gosford and Watereaton Parish Council - clerk@gosfordandwatereaton-pc.gov.uk
Elsfield Parish Council - james.p@transitiongroup.co.uk
Woodeaton Parish Council - peter.hore@chem.ox.ac.uk
Wytham Parish Council - stella_ogara@yahoo.co.uk
Yarnton Parish Council - yarntonparishcouncil@gmail.com

Government Related:

The Homes and Communities Agency – david.warburton@hca.gsx.gov.uk
Natural England – consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
The Environment Agency – jack.moeran@environment-agency.gov.uk
Historic England – e.seast@historicengland.org.uk / martin.small@historicengland.org.uk
The Highways Agency – planningse@highwaysengland.co.uk

Mobile Phone Operators:

Vodafone and O2 – EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk
Three – jane.evans@three.co.uk
EE – public.affairs@ee.co.uk

Health Related:

Primary Care Trust – oxon.gpc@nhs.net / david.knight@oxfordshirepct.nhs.uk

Utilities Related:

Scottish Southern Electricity – chris.gaskell@sse.com
Centrica - views@centrica.com
Thames Water (property services) – ctbell@savills.com

Others:

Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area
Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area
Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area
Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area
Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area.

Adam Symons
01/03/2018

Annex 9 - Contact Email and Responses from Statutory Consultees

Contact Email from WNF:

From: Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum [mailto:wolvercotenf@gmail.com]

Sent: 12 March 2018 21:58

To: John Bleach <wolvercotenf@gmail.com>

Subject: Stakeholder Consultation on Wolvercote Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Neighbourhood Planning Consultees,

Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum (WNF) is the legally designated body for the Wolvercote Neighbourhood Plan Area (WNPA) (designated January 2014), under the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012).

Together with our community and elected local councillors, the Forum has been working over the last four years to develop a Neighbourhood Plan to meet the following vision:

" In 15 years, Wolvercote Ward, which stretches from Cutteslowe Park in the east to Godstow in the west, will be an attractive, economically vibrant and culturally lively area. It will be for people of all ages, backgrounds and interests, and will have a strong sense of community. All new building developments should be sustainable and of a high quality, designed to be sensitively integrated with existing buildings so that the valued character of the streets and the green open spaces in all of the Ward's distinct localities is retained and enhanced."

Using feedback from a series of consultations with local residents including a formal six week consultation, Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum has produced a draft Plan that sets out our policy proposals for the next 15 years. The final draft of this Plan will to be submitted to Oxford City Council, who will themselves carry out a further six week statutory consultation.

Prior to this, we would like to invite all statutory consultation bodies, whose interests may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan in Wolvercote, to make their views known on the attached draft.

If you have any comments on this draft Plan, please respond on or before Tuesday 24rd April 2018 to this email.

Best Wishes,

Sadie Paige (Secretary, Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum)

Responses (and date) received from (see Annex 10 for full content of responses):

Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks (13th March 2018)

Environment Agency (14th March 2018)

Highways England (16th March 2018)

Oxford Clinical Commissioning Group (23rd March 2018)

Natural England (23rd March 2018)

Oxford Preservation Trust (18th April 2018)

Historic England (23rd April 2018)

Cherwell District Council (24th April 2018)

Oxford City Council (27th April 2018)

Regulation 14 Consultation – Statutory Consultee Responses

Comment From	Specific Policy	Specific Comment	Advice / Suggested Change	Forum Response	SP Comment
Historic England	Principles	We are disappointed that there is no mention of the historic environment in the Vision. However, we welcome General Principle 8, although we would prefer it to be reworded as “ <i>New developments must conserve or enhance the significance, special interest, character and appearance of buildings or groups of buildings of historical significance, whether listed buildings or within the Conservation Area or not</i> ”.	Not necessary – although the SC may decide that this is an improvement on the current text. (see comment from OPT and suggested changes)	amend vision statement. Use OPT one - see below	small change to item 8
	Range of Policies	We consider that Policies GBC1, GBC2, GBC3, BEC2, CHC1, HEC1 and HEC2 whilst entirely laudable (particularly Policy HEC2), are not drafted as planning policies and do not, therefore, conform with these requirements. We suggest, therefore, that they are either redrafted to be clear planning policies, or identified clearly and separately from the planning policies as other community aspirations or proposals.	These are labelled as community policies, and are identified clearly and separately as such. They therefore are not required to conform to the same requirements as planning policies.	leave as is they are community policies. Poss add definition?	definition of Community Policy is already in the doc
	GBC2	Cemeteries are often places of historical significance. We suggest therefore that Policy GBC2, whether redrafted or identified separately from the planning policies, also require cemeteries to be managed with their historic significance in mind.	This is a community policy dealing with green spaces, not historic significance. This issue has not been identified through consultations.		Comment seems reasonable but poss add to HE section
	BES1	We note that Policy BES1 as drafted encourages proposals for new development on Brownfield sites. Is it genuinely the intention to actively encourage new development on Brownfield sites, or simply to prioritise the use of Brownfield sites should new development be proposed ? If the former, we would like to see a caveat included in the policy requiring development not to harm the significance, special interest, character or appearance of heritage assets.	Not sure if there is a real difference between actively encouraging or prioritising? Protection of heritage assets is included in the Heritage policies.	JB to change BES1	done
	BES5, HES2 and HES 1	Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework states “... <i>neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.</i> ” We feel that neither Policy BES5 nor Policy HES1 quite match up to this requirement; whereas the former is robust, it could give greater guidance on other aspects of design e.g. architectural features, plot layouts, boundary treatments, landscaping etc. Policy HES1 is less robust (“ <i>have reference and regard to</i> ”) and has no detail. However, Policy HES2 does help, and taken together, these three policies could perhaps be considered to satisfy the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework. Nevertheless, we suggest that consideration be given to combining these three policies into one comprehensive and robust design policy.	The point of the comment is understood. However, it is recommended to keep these policies separate, especially considering that the Character Assessments are going to be an important piece of ongoing work.	keep 3 policies separate, review wording of each in this context	not done
	HES1	The statement on page 35 that the “ <i>WNF will co-ordinate the preparation of Character Assessments for Lower and Upper Wolvercote (outside the Conservation Area), the Woodstock Road area, Five Mile Drive area and the Cutteslowe Park area</i> ” suggests that, at the present time, the required “ <i>understanding and evaluation of</i> [the area’s] <i>defining characteristics</i> ” does not exist. Historic England considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan. Characterisation studies can also help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. We therefore welcome the proposed preparation of Character Assessments in the section on Heritage and Local Character (the appendix to this letter contains links to characterisation methodologies and we would be pleased to advise further).	Noted	thanks!	done
	HES3	We welcome Policy HES3 and note the reference to buildings of “ <i>local character and interest</i> ”. However, is there a list of locally-important buildings and features ? Non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity. Have the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record and Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment been consulted, the former for non-scheduled archaeological sites, some of which may be of national importance ?	Some of this detail will come out in the Character Assessments. The other question relates to the detail collated by the Heritage Working Group – is the SC party to this and can they answer this question?	Add link to conservation report	done

Consultees

	General	Has a survey of the condition of grade II buildings in the Plan area been undertaken ? Has there been any or is there any ongoing loss of character, particularly within the Conservation Area, through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation, insensitive streetworks etc.	Some of this detail will come out in the Character Assessments. The other question relates to the detail collated by the Heritage Working Group – is the SC party to this and can they answer this question?	do when we do the CA's	done
Cherwell DC	General	Page 8, second para. – it would be helpful if reference were made to the adjoining Cherwell District	Agree that this would be helpful and this change is proposed.	make change to Para 8 noting Cherwell, South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse.	done
	General	Page 8, fifth para. – reference should be made to the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 being part of the Development Plan for the immediately adjoining area. Reference should also be made to the on-going Partial Review of the Cherwell Local Plan which was submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 5 March 2018. It should be recognised that the Partial Review contains draft strategic policies proposing development adjacent to the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe areas. It is noted that there is some recognition of the latter on page 28. New strategic development (if approved) would bring significant change to the area to the north of Oxford including for transport and the provision of supporting facilities. The Partial Review is intended to align with the County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP4), particularly its Oxford Transport Strategy and the planned provision of new 'rapid transit' routes. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan cannot predict the outcome of the Loat type of key worker housing is proposed, or what type of affordable housing is acceptable	Agree that this would be helpful and this change is proposed – to the section on whay do we need a NP?	add a paragraph about our NPA's rural contiguous boundaries	done
	GBC4	Page 19, Policy GBC4 – New Designated Local Green Spaces – Cutteslowe and Sunnymead Park. Please note for context that the Partial Review of the Local Plan (draft Policy PR6a) makes provision for additional parkland to be provided immediately north of Cutteslowe Park.	Noted.	noted	done
Oxford Preservation Trust	Principles	8) Heritage. Oxford Preservation Trust would like to amend the wording to read: “new developments must respect buildings or groups of buildings of historical significance within the local area, whether designated heritage assets and/or within conservation areas or not”. In our view this would help to ensure that it is not just the immediate vicinity that is considered, but the slightly wider context. In addition, using the wording “designated heritage asset” would align the WNP with the National Planning Policy Framework (both current and proposed revised version).	Suggest changing 'listed buildings' to 'designated heritage assets'.	ammend vision statement	done
	Principles	12) Green spaces and biodiversity. Oxford Preservation Trust would like to see the inclusion of our Wolvercote Lakes nature reserve in the list of green spaces currently provided for local residents.	Suggest adding this green space to the list.		done
	Green Spaces	GB STRATEGIC POLICIES. Oxford Preservation Trust supports WNP policies for Green Space and Biodiversity. As above, we would like to see the addition of the clause “Wolvercote Lakes nature reserve is owned and managed by Oxford Preservation Trust.” at the end of the list of registered common land as this area is also publicly accessible green space.	Suggest an addition of suggested text.	text changed	done
	GBS4	Allotments. We would like to see the inclusion of a reference to the fact that Godstow allotments and the Wolvercote Community Orchard are owned by Oxford Preservation Trust.	Suggest an addition of suggested text.	no change	done
	BES5	We would like to see height added as one of the aspects to be specifically considered, along with bulk, materials etc. There is currently pressure to build higher in Oxford and this must be treated with considerable caution.	Height is already included in BES5.	OCC have a different opinion on what height-related restrictions can be included.	done
	General	Please could you amend the reference to the “2015 View Cones Study Report” to “Assessment of the Oxford View Cones (2015) produced by Oxford Preservation Trust, Oxford City Council and Historic England”.	Suggest an addition of suggested text.	yes. SP change	done
	Maps	We would like the Green Spaces Plan which will be in Annex 4 to show the 25 acres in Wolvercote and Godstow owned by Oxford Preservation Trust. We attach a map showing the location of our land.	Noted – for the party which is preparing Annex 4?	Thanks! 3 types of green space: private land, common and public access	
NHS Oxfordshire CCG	General	The inclusion of health considerations around air quality, the need for community health, and activities for the prevention of ill health, which we welcome. Likewise consideration of travel to health facilities, and affordable housing for key workers in developer discussions.	Noted.	noted, no change	done
	Housing	Page 23 – as per the paragraph below, we welcome the support for suitable housing for our ageing population, however request that OCCG is included in discussions for any such conversion, expansion, or build, as these facilities do put considerable pressure on our local GP practices, and this needs to be recognised with associated funding for infrastructure.	Noted	noted, no change	done

Consultees

	BES8 and CHS2	Page 23 and 31 - We note the paragraphs below, and ask that health be included for infrastructure funding under s106 or CIL, as per the OCCG policy included as <u>appendix 1</u> :	Noted	look at OCC comment. They request that policy is deleted	done
	CHS2	This funded infrastructure requirement is not limited to the build of 100 dwellings, and needs to be considered for any builds over 10 dwellings, and any single Care Home type facility, which place considerable pressure on practices, as stated above	Noted – This is a wider issue for the emerging OCC Local Plan and its general approach towards developer contributions and infrastructure funding.	look at OCC comment	done
Natural England	Green Spaces	Page 15 GB Strategic Policies; the Special Area of Conservation within the impact risk zone of the Neighbourhood Plan Area is Oxford Meadows.	Would the public know that Oxford Meadow is Port Meadow?	MB will re-word	done
	GBS2	Page 16 Policy GBS2; we advise you reword part of the second statement to read: 'New development must not put protected and designated sites and Common Land at risk from increased pollution (air, water or other) and recreational pressure'.	Suggest an addition of suggested text.	MB will re-word	done
	GBS4	Page 16 Policy GBS4; we advise you reword part of the body of text supporting this policy. 'Should' should be reworded to 'will' 'in order to achieve biodiversity net gain in line with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF.	Suggest an addition of suggested text.	MB will re-word	done
	GBS5	Page 17 Policy GBS5; we advise that careful consideration is given when compensating lost habitat. Any re-creation of habitat lost should be like-for-like and should be enhanced ecologically in a way that is appropriate for the habitat and species within it. We also advise you mention the need to consider priority species and habitats.	which may result in significant harm to sites and/or species of ecological value as defined by Policy CS12 of the Oxford Core Strategy or an equivalent development plan, will not be permitted, unless the developer can demonstrate that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the loss. Also, this loss must be mitigated for and compensated for on a like-for-like basis elsewhere within the Plan Area by providing a replacement habitat of an equivalent or higher ecological value, that is appropriate for the habitat and species within it, and which provides net gains in biodiversity. Consideration should be given to the importance of wildlife corridors and priority species and habitats."	MB will re-word	done
	GBC1	Page 18 Policy GBC1; we advise you reword this policy to mention that provision of trees and shrubs in new development will also increase habitat connectivity and work towards a biodiversity net gain for the Plan Area.	properly maintained with a view to the protection of biodiversity and as wildlife corridors. Appropriate planting and cutting should be carried out on verges, to encourage pollinating insects. Provision of trees and shrubs in new development will be encouraged in order to reduce air pollution, increase habitat connectivity and mitigate against rising temperatures. Trees and hedges on verges should be retained, and street planting and their required maintenance should be an important part of new developments."	MB will re-word, add a Spatial Policy to Built Environment	done

This page is intentionally left blank