

Appendix 2: Summary of comments received

Comments received	City Council response
Acknowledge that this site can make a positive contribution to Oxford however the brief lacks information about some key technical and design issues	The brief is intended to help provide an overall framework and guidance only; this will need to be supplemented by detailed technical assessments for development proposals. It is appropriate that this additional level of detail is provided on a site-specific basis through the pre-application and planning application processes.
Ensure the status of the document is clear in the brief	Agree, amendments have been made for clarity at paragraph 2.3
Ensure consultation that has been undertaken has been set out in the brief	Consultation has been carried out with landowners and key stakeholders on the brief. It is considered that this is an appropriate level of consultation for a document of this type. As stated at paragraphs 2.3 and 3.2 this will be supplemented by a broader consultation on the Local Plan.
The brief does not adequately consider building lines and flood constraints	Consider that the brief provides a good level of guidance on the issues of flood risk (paragraphs 5.1-5.4) and a clear principle on the building line (paragraph 8.4); the potential interaction between the two has now been made explicit in a new title for Figure 9.
The Brief should emphasise the demand for more central locations for R & D development and the requirements of occupiers in the context of an open innovation district	Consider this is clear, particularly in paragraphs 2.1 and 4.2. This will also be picked up through the Local Plan.
Support the opportunities to provide and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure opportunities	Noted
It is unhelpful to be too prescriptive on building heights and the TAN goes beyond the adopted development plan policy	Agree that the brief cannot be prescriptive. However, it is considered that an appropriate level of information and guidance has been provided. Further explanation on the initial assessment of heights which has been carried out has been added to paragraph 8.7, together with acknowledgement that further rigorous testing and analysis will be required on site-specific proposals.

Although supportive of the vision to reduce car parking the brief must reflect commercial realities and the requirements of potential occupiers	Reduction of car parking is an adopted policy of the Local Plan (M3) which applies to the whole city; this is referenced in paragraph 5.14 as a key consideration in this location. That policy will be used to assess proposals that come forward in this area.
The brief places limitations on making efficient use of land in this urban context and should be reconsidered	Disagree, one of the key objectives of the City Council is to make efficient use of land within the city, this is one of the drivers for the production of the brief. There are also site-specific constraints and considerations to be considered in determining the appropriate mass and form of new buildings in this location.
Reducing the number of access points is not set out in Oxford Local Plan policy M1 and it could result in displacement of traffic along residential routes	This is a request of the County Council as Highways Authority (see their comment in table below) to help improve movement flows along Botley Road. It is envisaged that a reduction in car journeys associated with the changes of use would allow a reduction in access points and facilitate an improvement in the pedestrian and cycling environments. Any proposals to reduce access points would be subject to further testing at application stage.
Supportive of landscape improvements but they must ensure the most efficient use of land	Agree, consider that paragraphs 8.1-8.7 provide a helpful and balanced set of principles through which individual proposals can come forward.
The building line along the Botley Road is understood and supported in principle but needs further consultation with Environment Agency in terms of predicted flood extents, flow and storage	Paragraph 8.7 makes it clear the brief should be read in conjunction with EA flood maps to understand site potential. The planning application process provides the right opportunity to explore this issue further when site-specific proposals are available for testing.
Supportive of principles in the brief guiding height however the brief is unclear (para 8.7) as to what analysis has taken place to inform the prescribed heights in the brief	Agree, more explanation of the assessment has been added to paragraph 8.7 to clarify the process which has been undertaken. It is not considered that the approach taken in the brief is prescriptive.
The brief is too prescriptive to support innovative development in this location as the parameters imposed will incentivise permitted development conversions on a piecemeal basis	Disagree, this brief does not set policy and is not considered to be prescriptive. Care was taken in framing the brief that many innovative proposals of this type elsewhere in Oxford, would have been able to be delivered within the guidance provided.

The brief is too arbitrary about heights of buildings and too prescriptive and should adopt a criteria based approach which seeks to safeguard residential amenity and the impact on wider views particularly of the city centre	Disagree, an appropriate level of assessment work by urban design and conservation officers informed the sections on heights and views. An amendment has been made to paragraph 8.7 to explain the basis of that work. This will need to be supplemented by further assessment work in the context of site-specific proposals at planning application stage and this has also been added as a note for clarity to paragraph 8.7.
A complete landscape visual impact assessment should be included and form part of the evidence base for the brief	As above; additional text has been added to paragraph 8.7 to make it clear that this is an initial assessment and that more rigorous testing and analysis (such as LVIA) would need to accompany individual proposals that might come forward.
The brief lacks meaningful consultation and this brief should be subject to a six week consultation.	Consultation has been carried out with landowners and key stakeholders on the brief. It is considered that this is an appropriate level of consultation for a document of this type. As stated at paragraphs 2.3 and 3.2 this will be supplemented by a broader consultation on the Local Plan.
The impact upon the Osney Town Conservation Area is only relevant to proposals to the east of the retail park and that should be clear in the brief	Disagree, the historic character of Osney Town Conservation Area is identified as a heritage consideration for the whole site in the brief, on the basis of the approach taken in the approved High Buildings TAN and the evidence base underlying that.
Improved access for cyclists and pedestrians is supported	Agree.

Comments from Oxfordshire County Council	City Council response
R & D would have less impact upon the highway network than formal office uses which would have a higher density of workers	Noted
References to other uses in the Brief needs to be clarified	Consider that paragraph 2.1 deals with this issue
Locate cycle parking which is covered and well designed close to the entrance to the buildings to encourage cycling to the site	Agree, paragraph 8.3 refers to the County Council's guidance on the design of pedestrian and cycle facilities.
Rationalised access is needed to ensure walking and cycling across them along Botley Road are interrupted as little as possible	Noted and agree, this is referred to at Figure 9 and in the key objectives box at paragraph 7.4

This page is intentionally left blank