

logz 313

Policy DMZ

summarised

View Response

Response Details

From Wanda Kemp-Welch

Date Started: 28 Dec 2018 15:49. Last modified: 28 Dec 2018 15:49

Status Complete

Response ID #675240

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 Planning and Regeneration, 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

3/3.1
1184 /
DH2

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 checked="" 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.

Tall buildings are generally disliked by the public: both their residents and people walking past them. They are dominating, generating the alienation feelings (as well as strong wind around them). They would detract from the spires of Oxford colleges and churches. They are not necessary to create a varied skyline.

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 should be a limit to the height of buildings allowed in Oxford, there are such limits in other historical cities e. g. Copenhagen.

20/2

Policy DHI

View Response

Response Details

From Wanda Kemp-Welch

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

Status Complete

Response ID #675223


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 Planning and Regeneration, 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

1785
S/13. 2

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

6.8

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 checked="" 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.

It should have been made clear that outside the conservation areas (which need more protection and where demolishing old buildings will not be allowed) architecture should be 21st century and not mock Gothic, Georgian or Victorian (plenty of these in Oxford).

Chapter 6, supposedly about built heritage does not mention protection of historic buildings but, strangely, only 'enhancement'.

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 should be stricter safeguards for protecting historic buildings, such as no new alterations/ extensions to be allowed that would be seen from streets in conservation areas, no full-height extensions going beyond front and rear building lines, no building up valleys between roofs, no demolitions of original buildings or period extensions.