

224

Policy M3

Summarised.

View Response

Response Details

From JOHN HARRISON

Date Started: 27 Dec 2018 16:58. Last modified: 27 Dec 2018 16:58

Status Complete

Response ID #675044

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address



Postal Address

Postcode OX3 7RN

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 Transport and Parking

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

224-1
946
Paragraph 7.29

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.

The recognised difficulties in access and parking at hospital sites, particularly the John Radcliffe and Churchill in Headington, have been discussed by the Council of Governors of the Oxford University Hospitals Foundation Trust and it has been agreed that comments should be submitted to the Oxford Plan 2036 consultation on behalf of the publicly elected governors.

We are commenting specifically on Chapter 7: Ensuring effective movement into and around the city, (iii) Parking, Parking in non-residential developments and district centres, paragraphs 7.29/7.30. It is stated in 7.29 that: Major redevelopment of non-residential sites is expected across Oxford during the plan period. Many of these sites already have substantial amounts of parking, including provision for disabled parking. Additional parking will not be allowed in the event of redevelopment and the reduction of parking is encouraged. We ask that this is followed by an additional paragraph stating that: Hospitals have a particular need for visitor parking. Site-specific policies will be developed with hospital trust management teams, promoting rationalisation of parking provision on the hospital sites, and recognising growing pressures from increasing numbers of hospital visits.

In making this proposal, we note that the preceding Preferred Options paper included (as a preferred option) the wording: The hospitals have a particular need for visitor parking. If site-specific policies are included for larger sites to cover a range of issues, there will be scope to promote rationalisation of parking provision on the hospital sites, for example into shared multi-storey car parks." We also note information provided in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Oxfordshire (JSNA 2018). In particular, District councils have ambitious targets for new housing and an increase in the Oxfordshire population by about a quarter is predicted by 2030. Such projected increases, together with increases in the proportion of the population over 65y and over 85y, emphasise the need to consider hospital access separately.

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»