

View Response

Response Details

From Sabina Lovibond

Date Started: 11 Dec 2018 16:24. Last modified: 11 Dec 2018 16:29

Status Complete

Response ID #672207

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address

Postal Address

Postcode

Gender

What is your age?

If you are under 16,
what is your date of
birth?

What is your ethnic
group?

Your ethnic group (if
you answered other)

Are you disabled?

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest

Survey Types

1

Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number below)

- Paragraph Policies Map
- Policy Number Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

RE8, G8 DH5

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

	Yes	No
(a) is legally compliant?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(b) is sound?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
(c) complies with the duty to co-operate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3

Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

(a) positively prepared?

(b) justified?

(c) effective?

(d) consistent with national policy?

4

Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

«No response»

5

What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Sorry, I can't see how to integrate these points into the online form as designed (except under some broad, non-technical notion of 'soundness'), but these were my thoughts on looking at the hard copy of the plan in the St Aldate's office this morning. With thanks - Sabina Lovibond

p. 12 'Objectives' - there is a reference here to 'knowledge intensive businesses such as education, health, science and technology'. I know all these things provide local employment, but education and health (at least) are not themselves 'businesses', but services.

param
1-25
2009-1
1151

p. 72: 'The management of noise is about encouraging the right acoustic environment in the right place at the right time ... This can mean allowing some places to become noisier within reason, whilst others become quieter.' 'Noisier within reason' - that sounds alarming. All exposure to noise not of one's own choosing is a hardship from which residents need to be protected.

p. 73 (Policy RE8: Noise and Vibration) 'Planning permission will not be granted for development sensitive to noise in locations which experience high levels of noise, unless it can be demonstrated, through a noise assessment, that appropriate attenuation measures will be provided ... Conditions will be used to secure mitigation measures and operational commitments.' The experience of north Oxford residents affected by the activities of Network Rail in recent years does not inspire confidence on this point. Greater vigilance is required! (And greater resolve in the enforcement of attenuation measures.)

p. 78 (Protection of biodiversity and geo-diversity): 'When assessing whether a site is suitable for compensation, consideration will be given to the access, enjoyment and connection to nature that the biodiversity site to be lost has brought to a locality.' Good to know, but one hopes that compensation (as opposed to conservation) will very rarely be brought into play.

pp. 80-83: Also good to see policy to mitigate any loss of biodiversity resulting from development on residential garden land, and requiring demonstration of improvements to 'biodiversity or amenity value' in the case of other green spaces. But 'amenity value' should not be interpreted in a sense that is soft on anti-social/ noisy/nuisance activities, e.g. drone flying, quad bike riding, etc., which spoil green spaces for peaceful users.

RE8
299.2
1152

92
299.3
1153

96
299.4
1154

298
299.6
1156

Also good to see measures for the protection of existing trees under policy G8 - but again, this should be subject to an interpretation (of when retention of a tree is 'feasible') that is tree-friendly and not too indulgent to developers.

DH5
299.5
1155

p. 100 (Policy DH5, Local Heritage Assets): I hope due consideration will be given under this heading to small-scale, vernacular (including industrial) architecture as well as the more eye-catching stuff.