

### Appendix 3: Review and Amendment Schedule

3.1 Outdoor Spaces – Streets section		Response
2. Queen Street, Bonn Square	Separate out Bonn Square, so it is a space in its own right – important public realm, performance space, etc.	Will be amended in final version
9. Park Street, Hythe Bridge Street, Frideswide Square, New Road, Castle Quarter	Separate out Castle Quarter, so it is a space in its own right – similar to the way that Gloucester Green is treated in the Action Plan.	Will be amended in final version

### 3.2 Meetings and Survey proposed amendments

UID (Respondent Code)	CONSULTATION RESPONSE	OFFICER RESPONSE	REVISIONS (WHERE REQUIRED)	RESPONSE
1001(iii)	P.16[?], p.78 – Brookes listed as ‘technical education’?	Review the context	Review and update in context	Done
1001 (v)	Built Env – SWOT, strength, p.14	Including ‘ <i>historic</i> ’ built env.	Include	Done
1002 (vi)	Unnecessary traffic crossing city centre.	Include, see also S083(ii) - THREAT	Review/Include	Included as a weakness as opposed to threat.
1003 (v)	Drop the word “Oxford Pass” and use something like loyalty card or similar	Review and update wording.	Update	Cannot locate this term, amended in previous iteration
1003 (vii)	Connection between Objectives...to promote overnight tourism, should be “to achieve overnight tourism”. P.16, p.27. p.102	Review and update wording? Is there a wider significance in the use of the terms?	Update	Updated on P. 27 and P.102 (achieve) as response to the identified opportunity on p. 16 (promote)
1003 (viii)	Challenge on overnight stays is that the offer needs to be more diverse	Review and update wording – does it need to be ore ‘diverse’ does that phrase add anything?	Update	Done
1009 (vi)	Review all the CCAP	Comment of time or can be	Review	Reviewed SWOT,

	SWOT to be sure all have been adjusted in light of COVID e.g. 'strong business confidence'. The pandemic has changed that for some.	updated? Might require more specific wording.		and added caveats where appropriate. The specific comment about business confidence is true as a trend, though perhaps not for every business.
L002 (ii) (link 1001 (v))	Built Env – SWOT, strength	Include 'historic' built environment or give greater emphasis in the document	Review	Done
L005 (iv)	Challenge to attract and retain staff, not covered in AP	Can this be highlighted in appropriate place[s]? It is highlighted as a challenge by business	Review	Included as a threat, and under workstream 3 description.
S005 (iii)	Supporting ' <i>the best</i> ' (what does that mean, who decides?) p.27 retail is another key to growth, a mix of good retail shops, bars, restaurants and places of interest are key. Creating more residential buildings in the city centre is not.	Review – is this ambiguous in the document? Wording may need to be reviewed, so that it is more inclusive.	Review	Amended
S011 (i)	Strength is city centre compactness with everything being in a square mile - we don't promote this enough	Review, can this comment be integrated into the document – 'outdoor spaces' section and Map of the city area.	Review	Included as a strength. Option to add walking radius to maps, as part of review.
S012 (i)	Inclusion of Oxford Parkway, under connectivity and access.	Review, is that appropriate in the way it links to the city centre?	Review	Not considered to be an appropriate project in its own right. There is an

				existing project on Park & Ride Enhancements (1.7) which would include Oxford Parkway alongside others. Propose this is sufficient given site is outside the centre.
S017(ii)	Worcester St. car park should be part of the Park End St. plans.	Was this considered as part of the AP process?	Review	This is considered under West End Spatial Framework, but have specifically called out Worcester Street Car park as a remaining development opportunity under 3.1 Oxford West End.
S019(i)	Water fountains free to use around the City Centre	Suggestion fits with Getting the Basics Right.	Detailed comment for the project, no review required.	None
S031(i)	Plan does not recognise the needs of residents sufficiently.	Can the role of residents be acknowledged in the implementation of the Action Plan.	Review in document, key issue for implementation and delivery	Have included reference to inclusivity and affordable housing in general.
S032(i)	More affordable housing.	Would it be worthwhile to be specific: that there should be an increased amount of 'affordable' housing in the city centre, in particular? It's a point that is made by a	Review the document, for clarity.	Have included this as a specific call out when mentioning housing.

		number of respondents.		
S032(ii)	City Centre more inclusive – attract residents, as well as visitors and tourists.	'Inclusive' is a key concept for the city centre, but it is not evident through the AP – can this be reviewed?	Review and update accordingly	Have included reference to inclusivity and affordable housing in general, and especially in the description and objectives for workstream 4.
S040(i)	Greater emphasis on green and blue environmental infrastructure	Thoughts – term 'blue infrastructure' does not appear to be used in the document. My need explanation/definition in document.	Review	G/B infrastructure is often not a term well understood by general public. We have used green spaces and waterways. Specific reference and definition of GB infrastructure under Project 2.1.
S043(ii)	Access to University assets, including grounds	This should be reviewed as part of the delivery and implementation.	Review at delivery/implementation stage.	Note, no amendment
S044(ii)	Need to be provision for residents using vehicles in, around and to exit/enter homes	This is part of the wider transport plan consultation, but flag with colleagues	No update required	Note, no amendment
S048(i)	Greater emphasis on actions to address climate crisis	This is covered in the AP – review if 'greater emphasis' is required?	Review	See above, response to S040(i)
S048(iii)	Inclusivity – about people who live in and use place – not just visitor and tourists	See above, inclusive is a key concept	Review documents for emphasis/wording	See above
S049(i)	THREATS – add poor	This is part of the wider	No update required	Note, no

	transport infrastructure with slow journey times.	transport plan consultation, but flag with colleagues		amendment
S051(iv)	Distinction between Projects, Workstreams and Actions in the consultation a little confusing.	Note – review document for clarity	Review and update	Have added clarity on what actions are (under projects) as part of the AP hierarchy on page 25.
S057(i)	Greater emphasis on addressing the climate crisis	Note S048(i), above.	Review	Note, no amendment
S057(ii)	in the 'getting the mix rights' the plan should be more explicitly about the need to celebrate and reflect the different needs and traditions of people of different genders, race, class, etc..	Concept of 'inclusive' and 'inclusivity' – can this be reviewed and reflected in the AP?	Review	Has been clarified in the text.
S066(i)	Include measures to increase biodiversity in the city	Note S048(i), above	Review	Note, no amendment
S073(i)	Add to Threats - Failure to support people working in Oxford re affordable housing	Comments above on affordable housing and access to employees	Review	Included
S083(ii)	THREAT – ability to get across City Centre	Is this really a THREAT for the city centre? Or, a problem for places outside the city centre? Specific to transport consultation.	Noted and share with colleagues	Unnecessary through-traffic and resultant congestion included as a weakness
S121(i)	Protect music & arts venues	Can this be included in the AP? Key issue from the consultation response.	Review	Have included more reference under 3.6 stimulate the night

				time economy.
S143(i)	Opportunity 'Enhance accessibility and sustainable travel options' is currently a Weakness.	Should this be reflected as a weakness, or is it sufficiently covered?	Review	Bus competition for road space included.
S152(iii)	No mention of Worcester car park.	Was this part of the discussion in developing the AP?	Check	Included
S169(ii)	Narrow pavements and obstructions are challenging	Public realm – Getting the basics right. Accept that this point will be looked at as part of projects/review of streets.	No Change required	Note, no amendment
S196(ii)	Inclusivity – improved environment for people with disabilities	Concept of inclusive, inclusivity – see above	Review	See above
S231(iii)	Homelessness is not an 'eyesore'	Review wording around this issue seems to lack empathy.	Review	No specific wording around homelessness being an eyesore, but perhaps the implication under the workstream objective. Have sought to make this more holistic about safety and inclusivity rather than just attractiveness and functionality.
S231(iv)	'Vibrant' city centre does not come from a 'business opportunity'	Review – city centre inclusive, see above	Review	Not clear what section or project this comment pertains to.

S254(i)	Innovation at the heart of the action plan and world class status	Check wording and emphasis in the plan.	Review	Have emphasized in strengths, in the strapline and description for workstream 3. Actions are already covered under 3.5 Workspace.
S266(i)	Oxford – eco-city an earth protector community	Can the env sections be updated to reflect this comment?	Review	Not clear what initiative this relates to.
S266(ii)	Shift away from emphasis on the commercial – sustainable future with different values	Inclusive?, as set out above – a key concept.	As above	See above
S268(i)	3.6 & 3.7 – specific mention of indie live music sector	Can this be included – there was a large response relating to music venues.	Review	Done
S281(i)	The objectives state "Reduce traffic congestion by limiting private motor vehicle trips through the city centre". I would like to see this changed to "...through and to the city centre"	Seems a fair point – should the wording be revised?	Review	Done
S286(i)	Beware experience and e-commerce - <i>Why get on a bus when I can usually go on Amazon?</i>	Comment noted, not an amendment.	No change required	Note, no amendment
S289(i)	'Big' retailers moving out is an opportunity rather than a threat	Only an opportunity if there is a plan to respond to it, check adaptive resilience – greater emphasis	Review	Done
S290(i)	Biggest threat to the City	Comment noted – not an	No change required	Note, no

	Centre is 'anti-car'	amendment.		amendment
S296(i)	"Encourage more student and residential uses" - this should be two separate questions: Encourage student uses - disagree Encourage residential uses - strongly agree.	Review wording in the document, it appears to conflate two issues in the response that can be reflected in the document	Review	Done
S301(i)	The emphasis on speculative commercial development throughout these proposals is far too great. Hotels and 'more overnight accommodation' are speculative and may well fail	Comment noted – not an amendment.	No change required.	Note, no amendment
S304(i)	City Council review asset policy – support indie and local business	Comment noted, not an amendment for AP.	No change required.	Note, no amendment
S304(vi)	Page 7 – city centre conservation plan has not been produced. Part One completed – Part Two – management – has not	Comment noted – work is ongoing with the document, review the wording	Review	Done
S309(i)	Threats: Centrally imposed budgetary restraints	Comment noted – review wording – not an amendment	No change required.	Note, no amendment
S330(ii)	Repurpose existing buildings – don't demolish	Comment noted – AP does not/can not set out an approach relating to all existing buildings – not an amendment.	No change required.	Note, no amendment
S330(iv)	Really unfortunate that getting homeless people	Review wording in the AP, does not seem to get the	Review	Amended the tone of the workstream

	off the streets is portrayed as a way of making people feel safer.	appropriate message across.		description and objectives.
S337(i)	Whenever I've been to other parts of Oxford they're more like 'sprawl' in that it's only residential buildings, rather than any mixed use. (A lot of this thinking comes from the book Happy City by Charles Montgomery - would highly recommend!)	Comment noted, mixed-use and 'getting the mix right', which includes resi. Is part of the approach advocated. Wording may need to be refined.	Review	Note, no amendment
S341(i)	Under 3. to include Private and social residential housing	Review wording.	Review	Done
S341(ii)	Under 4. to include how to create community hubs e.g. spaces to bring all users together aside from the commercial and council-supported leisure sector i.e. publicly accessible spaces for residents meetings, book clubs, community groups etc.	Review wording – the AP does talk about 'outdoor' spaces.	Review	Included in the description of workstream 3, and under 3.3 Vacant units.
S341(iii)	Under 1, to also include tackling more directly private school traffic solutions for the Woodstock and Banbury Roads i.e. obligate schools to create zero emissions zones and support that	Comment noted, this is covered more generally in the plan and not a specific issue for the City Centre AP to respond to.	No change required.	Note, no amendment

	with additional private bus services.			
S347(i)	Residential uses and student accommodation should not fall under the same umbrella	Comment noted – see S296(i)	See above	Amended
S351(i)	Heritage buildings be explicitly recognised as a strength, as well as a weakness, as the historic fabric of the buildings adds to the attractiveness and unique character	Noted – review and check wording that this is reflected in the document	Review	Amended
S355(i)	No proper east-west cycle route (in a 'Cycling City')	Noted – check document if it requires updating	Review	Specific transport interventions are covered under Connecting Oxford.  Have added a call out to this effect, so no confusion between the two documents.
S358(i)	Equal weight should be given to cycling as to public transport. And what is active travel if not cycling and walking (it isn't such as...)	Movement hierarchy – cycling and walking included – no amendment	No change required.	Note, no amendment
S358(ii)	And by the way the pictogram of a person cycling, as the first and therefore noticeable item, in 'Threats' is a worry to us!	Review the Threats pictogram	Review	Done

S358(iii)	A project on cycle route network and connectivity. Could you please add a project on continuous cycling routes and network through the city centre. A major issue is the lack of through routes for cycling	Review – this is covered in the streets section, but may need ‘joining-up’	Review	Specific transport interventions are covered under Connecting Oxford.  Have added a call out to this effect, so no confusion between the two documents.
S358(v)	Workstream 4 - Please change your description “sometimes competing objectives - for example, between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists”. There should be no competition - in the hierarchy of road users, pedestrians and cyclists come above motor vehicles. Removing motor vehicles is essential to create an attractive city centre	See movement hierarchy, but wording could be amended.	Review	Done
S364(i)	Strength - University and constituent colleges	Review, check emphasis of the document	Review	Done
S374(i)	Threat: economy reliant on workers and visitors. Wrong to group these two sectors together	Review – related to ‘inclusivity’ and affordability issues relating to living in/or close to the city centre.	Review	This point has to do with footfall, and the reliance of workers and visitors for this due a small local population in the centre itself. Have clarified this.

S379(i)	Should there also not be an objective to reduce private motor vehicle trips TO the city centre as well as THROUGH it?	Noted – not amendment	No change required.	Note, no amendment
S381(ii)	Threat: increased flood risk with ongoing climate change	Review – is this general or specific to the city centre of Oxford?	Review	Climate change included as threat
S387(i)	Disabled people & families with children need vehicular access. Freedom of travel is a human right	Review – inclusivity. Check as should be covered in the specific projects	Review	See above
S390(iii)	Tourism and Visitor Management - subsection 'diversification of tourist flows'. In order to build a successful, sustainable and inclusive city, the strategy of diversifying tourism	Review	Review	Comment unclear