

182 307

Policy H7

summarised

# View Response

## Response Details

From Tamara Frishberg

Date Started: 18 Dec 2018 20:13. Last modified: 18 Dec 2018 20:13

Status Complete

Response ID #673790

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address [Redacted]

Postal Address [Redacted] Oxford

Postcode [Redacted]

Gender [Redacted]

What is your age? [Redacted]

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

What is your ethnic group? [Redacted]

Your ethnic group (if you answered other)

Are you disabled? [Redacted]

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position within the Organisation

Areas of Interest Transport and Parking

Survey Types Online Consultations, Group discussions

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

H7

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

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

3

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

1172  
307.1

(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.

I believe that the policy of supporting community led housing is entirely sound and one of the best ways to provide affordable housing in a city where land is at such a premium. But so far this commitment has withered in the face of the power and economic might of big developers. This policy will be sound only if it is adhered to in practice.

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.

«No response»

2 of 2

Policy H1

# View Response

## Response Details

From Tamara Frishberg

Date Started: 18 Dec 2018 20:08. Last modified: 18 Dec 2018 20:08

Status Complete

Response ID #673787

---

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address [REDACTED]

Postal Address [REDACTED] Oxford

Postcode [REDACTED]

Gender [REDACTED]

What is your age? [REDACTED]

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

What is your ethnic  
group? [REDACTED]

Your ethnic group (if  
you answered other)

Are you disabled? [REDACTED]

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position  
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest Transport and Parking

Survey Types Online Consultations, Group discussions

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

307.2  
-1173  
3.11 / H1

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

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

The document notes in paragraph 3.4 the "congestion on roads around the city caused by employees travelling into the city to work" and in 3.8 details the constraints on building new housing in the city. The logical solution would be logical to develop employment sites in surrounding smaller urban areas. Instead the emphasis has been to provide most of the housing outside of Oxford, thus contributing further to an already untenable traffic situation. Additionally, Instead of putting housing in the Oxford North site, the city has agreed to a plan which will bring in about 4,400 new workers to Oxford. This is certainly not sound, joined-up thinking.

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.

Land in Oxford (where there is almost no unemployment) should be used for housing. Much more emphasis should be placed on providing small homes with communal facilities for older people who tend not to use cars but still want and need

to be close to shops and other facilities. The council pays lip service to such communities but then sells out to the highest bidder. Oxford North should be totally redesigned to provide housing rather than employment. There is already adequate public transport for people who would live there to get into the city centre, and thus the disastrous effect of putting 4,400 jobs and in a triangle surrounded by three already clogged roads could be avoided. Building huge housing estates where occupants will need to come into Oxford using these roads is insane.