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| Appendix 3 – Precis of Consultation Responses in order received |
| **No.** | **Name** | **Support?** | **Folly Bridge** | **Keble Triangle** | **Science Quarter** | **St Thomas'** | **Radcliffe** | **General comments** |
| 1 | RM – resident | ✓ | n/c | Between the exceptional assets of the Keble, Parks & St Giles’ church. Heavily used by staff, students & others; variety of buildings of different ages. Need to be able to look after what is good & improve a cluttered setting. | Distinguished history; some very good buildings including exceptional museum (world class attraction). Conspicuous from the parks, needs extra protection. | Historic area with several important buildings, significant parts with a village-like feel. Much has been lost nearby with loss of community. Essential this is preserved & enhanced. | n/c |  |
| 2 | Oxford resident | ✓ | Character worthy of designation | History & character worthy of designation | Architecture & history worthy of designation  | History & character worthy of designation | Support inclusion due to history, aesthetics, cohesion |  |
| 3 | JC – other | ✓ | n/c | n/c | n/c | Last bit of C19 workers’ housing, important social history. Should keep remaining old city to balance with new. | n/c |  |
| 4 | ED – employee | ✓ | n/c | n/c | n/c | n/c | n/c | Thoroughly support the boundary changes |
| **No.** | **Name** | **Support?** | **Folly Bridge** | **Keble Triangle** | **Science Quarter** | **St Thomas'** | **Radcliffe** | **General comments** |
| 5 | Oxford resident | ✓ | History worthy of designation | Appearance worthy of designation | Character & appearance worthy of designation | n/c | n/c |  |
| 6 | Oxford resident | ✓ | n/c | n/c | Character worthy of inclusion | n/c | n/c |  |
| 7 | Oxford resident | ✓ | n/c | n/c | n/c | n/c | Whole site worthy of designation re existing buildings & future development | Great pity not in include whole Infirmary site. CA designation should influence new development in area. |
| 8 | OAHS | ✓ | n/c | Anomalous gap with no justification. Age & quality of buildings qualifies. Sufficient buildings of merit. Relationship to North Oxford. | Anomalous gap with no justification. Age & quality of buildings qualifies. Area of great historic importance; embodies growth of science teaching. | Strength integrity of CA, signal new buildings need to be of high standard, reduce likelihood of inappropriate buildings. | n/c | Additional information given on specific buildings in St Thomas’ and further history |
| 9 | SJSARA | ✓ | n/c | Anomaly it was left out. Fits best into Central CA. | Anomaly it was left out. | n/c | Disappointed whole site not proposed for designation. | Minor boundary changes seem sensible. |
| **No.** | **Name** | **Support?** | **Folly Bridge** | **Keble Triangle** | **Science Quarter** | **St Thomas'** | **Radcliffe** | **General comments** |
| 10 | JB – resident | ✓ | Bridge worth conserving. Appearance north of Thames Street needs rebuilding. | Worthy of designation – fulfils all criteria | Modern buildings may be of interest in future. Architecture & character worthy of designation. | Character worthy of designation | Worthy of designation – fulfils all criteria | Area north of Thames Street & south of Speedwell Street should not be included |
| 11 | Oxford Sciences Innovation | X | n/c | n/c | n/c | Island site inclusion is unwarranted. Retention of existing buildings will be required & be too expensive to refurbish. | n/c | Take into full consideration implications of declaring Island Site as an extension to the CA & the impact this would have on the ability of OSI to assist in the renaissance of the West End of Oxford. |
| 12 | Oxford Civic Society | ✓ | n/c | Buildings associated with Central, not North Oxford | Designation would ensure high quality design & appearance of replacement buildings | Designation needs urgent implementation | Disappointed whole site not proposed for designation. | CA should form a coherent spatial whole so policies can apply to whole area & not just setting. Recommendations thorough & well-judged. |
| **No.** | **Name** | **Support?** | **Folly Bridge** | **Keble Triangle** | **Science Quarter** | **St Thomas'** | **Radcliffe** | **General comments** |
| 13 | Liberal Democrat Councillors | ✓ | Grandpont CA is overdue; area would be best in that. | Common traits with existing Central CA. Designation would provide additional consideration at redevelopment stage. | Charts the uneven history of science growth; remnants of South Parks Road in heyday will be interesting for future. | Redevelopment may remove characterful streets & buildings. Island site has impressive buildings reflecting 19th century entrepreneurism. St Thomas's area shows local workers' cottages, lost throughout much of the city. Comfortably splits into 2 areas which need different approaches. | Would like Freud's and Blavatnik included, prefer the whole site. | Difficult to know what to conserve as what seems preserving changes with time. View cones & sight lines not included - omissions which need to be rectified. |
| 14 | University of Oxford Estates Services | X | n/c | Case for designation is weak & confused. Buildings are so different to Central CA – would be an inappropriate addition.  | Contains a range of buildings which are becoming obsolete due to requirements for science & research changing. Continuously evolving estate of buildings reflecting use & science of their day. Tighter science regulations require more flexible planning approach. Area as a whole does not stand up to assessment criteria. | n/c | Justification is inconsistent and contrary to reasons given for excluding other parts of the site. No additional heritage protection to listed buildings. | Proposals would place further constraints which would limit flexibility of future development opportunities. Technical report included to accompany comments. |
| **No.** | **Name** | **Support?** | **Folly Bridge** | **Keble Triangle** | **Science Quarter** | **St Thomas'** | **Radcliffe** | **General comments** |
| 15 | Christ Church College | X | n/c | n/c | n/c | Does not have special character required for designation. Would devalue existing CA. Already/can be protected under existing policies. Could inhibit proposals for imaginative regeneration. Would not be a more logical boundary. | n/c | The extension to the boundary would materially undermine any comprehensive plans being brought forward, particularly when considering the desire to support the proposals for redevelopment of Oxford Station. |