

1 of 2 205  
Summarised Policy SP3

# View Response

## Response Details

From Rob Pearson

Date Started: 28 Dec 2018 15:46. Last modified: 28 Dec 2018 15:46

Status Complete

Response ID #675236

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown**.

Email Address 

Postal Address

Postcode EC2R 8EJ

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 NewRiver REIT (c/o Nexus Planning)

Job Title / Position  
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest Planning and Regeneration

Survey Types

1

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

- Paragraph  Policies Map  
 Policy Number  Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

295.1  
1144  
SP3

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 checked="" 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.

NewRiver Retail has planning permission secured under planning application reference 16/03006/FUL for the comprehensive redevelopment of Templars Square. That planning permission should be referenced in the policy and it's supporting text as it provides important context for the redevelopment of the wider area. Any future masterplanning exercise should clearly be cognisant of it.

#### 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.

As set out above. Cross-reference should be made to the approved scheme 16/03006/FUL.

2 of 2

Policy V4

# View Response

## Response Details

From Rob Pearson

Date Started: 28 Dec 2018 15:36. Last modified: 28 Dec 2018 15:36

Status Complete

Response ID #675224

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown**.

Email Address 

Postal Address

Postcode EC2R 8EJ

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 NewRiver REIT (c/o Nexus Planning)

Job Title / Position  
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest Planning and Regeneration

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

V4

295.2  
5711  
2.562

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 checked="" 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 Council is seeking to apply restrictions to the ground floor uses of all their retail centres. Cowley Dostrict Centre has the greatest proportion of floorspace sought to be retained in Class A1 use (60%). By contrast, East Oxford, Headington and Summertown District Centres are 50%, and Blackbird Leys is 40%. The genesis of this Policy stems from Appendix 15 of the Oxford Retail and Leisure Study. At 1.44-1.45 of that document, the general shift towards a wider range of uses forming part of traditional centres is referenced. Table 17 then goes on to suggest a minimum of 70% Class A1. The Policy now proposed is slightly more 'generous' at 60%, but this still exceeds the 40-50% elsewhere. It is not obvious from the Evidence Base why a distinction has been drawn. Similarly, the Retail Study only made reference to restricting the Centre to 60% A class uses in its Secondary Frontages, whereas the Policy is suggesting a minimum of 85% across the board. Our clients consider this unduly restricting on their flexibility to operate successfully in an ever-changing retail and leisure sector.

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.

There is no evidence base to support the % figures. The proportion of A1 for the Cowley Centre should be brought in line with other District Centres (40 or 50%) and we question the 85% Class A restriction. A more appropriate level should be suggested through evidence submitted to Examination - we note that the Retail Study suggested 60%.