

Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation – Summary of online portal responses

Profile of Consultation Respondents:

Responses	Total	Percent
Member of the public (Littlemore Resident)	7	58.33%
Member of the public (Oxford Resident)	2	16.67%
Charity or Community Group	0	0.00%
Organisation	2	16.67%
Councillor	1	8.33%
Local Authority	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

Introductory Chapters of the Plan

Comments on the introductory chapters of the plan:

- The introductory chapters are well-written, detailed, and informative. I appreciated the effort to note the demographic profile and helpfully contextualise the role of the plan in the wider planning context.
- The views in this section do not align with my personal perspective and I strongly object the repeated inference that the council somehow represents anything other than its own agenda in this document.

Suggested modifications or improvements to introductory chapters:

- We have been consulted by the Parish and support the introduction of a NP for Littlemore.

Community Infrastructure Policies

CIS1 Replacement of community facilities

Response	Total	Percent
Support	7	58.33%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other Comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

CIS2 Improvement of existing community assets

Response	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other Comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

CIS3 Infrastructure needs and co-operation

Response	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other Comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

CIC1 Improvements to the range and quality of local shops and eating places

Response	Total	Percent
Support	8	66.67%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other Comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

CIC2 Improved range of, and access to, recreation opportunities especially for young people

Response	Total	Percent
Support	8	66.67%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other Comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

CIC3 Working with businesses and others to promote lifelong learning

Response	Total	Percent
Support	8	66.67%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other Comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

Additional comments:

- Strongly in favour of new eateries and retailers where you can purchase healthy food.
- I am particularly keen to see improvements to green spaces/recreation areas -- better walking/cycling access through to Blackbird Leys that doesn't feel like crossing a litter strewn wasteland and playground facilities that are on a par with Florence Park/Sandford rather than what is currently available.
A cafe of some kind and better shops (eg affordable fresh fruit and veg closer than heyford hill sainsburys) would be very welcome. Better public transport would also be appreciated--- littlemore isn't connected to the Oxford central railway station by a bus at all and going by taxi/car is not always practical given the traffic, cycling is the fastest option but not always possible with heavy luggage. It would make sense for this route to travel along the Abingdon Rd, so that Littlemore is connected to South Oxford which is relatively close. The cycle route along the bypass between the river bridge and Heyford hill Sainsbury's should also be separated by some kind of hedging from the road, to better protect cyclists and pedestrians and shield them from very bright oncoming headlights which dazzle and make it virtually impossible to see at night.

Suggested modifications or improvements to community infrastructure policies:

- Wherever "Walking, cycling" is mentioned in the document, it would be prudent to widen this term to include other forms of active travel particularly those focusing on accessibility such as wheeling, scooting etc.
- Would like more coffee shops too.

Local gigs and music events in e.g. old commercial buildings, pubs, community centres and new restaurants / cafes would be a great asset to the community.

Would like to see stronger wording regarding leisure facilities - let's reopen that swimming pool and give it a facelift!

Natural Environment Policies

NES1: Protection of, and access to, green and blue spaces

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

NES2 :Protection of wildlife habitats/ biodiversity

Response	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

NES3: Tree cover and protection

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

NES4: Protection of allotments

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

NEC1: Protecting and enhancing local parks and green spaces

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

NEC2: Provision of, and safe access to, green spaces

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

NEC3: Community support to protect the Natural Environment

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

NEC4: Increasing biodiversity and wildlife

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	8	66.67%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

Additional Comments

N.A.

Suggested modifications or improvements to natural environment policies:

- For policy NEC3, I would propose amending "campaigns involving talks and literature to motivate people to respect their environment" to "...respect and positively engage with their environment".
- At the end of Heyford Hill Lane it's not possible to cross under the ring road into Iffley - it seems like a wasted opportunity to expand the green walking / running / cycling routes in the area, as if you could reach Iffley lock on this side of the river you could do a scenic loop.

The cycle path by the ringroad has lots of litter and upon the bridge to the Thames path towpath noise and airpollution are not blocked by vegetation from the cycle path. Trees in pots and fencing please!

Built Environment Policies

BES1: Encouraging improved and new infrastructure

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	7	58.33%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

BES2: Sheltered and supported housing

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	6	50.00%
Support with modifications	2	16.67%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

BES3: Parking pressure

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	5	41.67%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	3	25.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

BES4: Resisting large HMOs and avoiding family houses becoming short-term letting properties

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	4	33.33%
Support with modifications	3	25.00%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other comments	1	8.33%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

BES5: Enhancing historic buildings

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	7	58.33%
Support with modifications	2	16.67%

Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

BES6: Encouraging energy efficiency retrofit

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	5	41.67%
Support with modifications	3	25.00%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

BEC1 Parking around Houses in Multiple Occupation

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	4	33.33%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	7	58.33%

Additional Comments:

- Whilst we support BES6 in principle this may not be practical for healthcare facilities. Healthcare assets can age very quickly and it may be more economically viable to replace them with new infrastructure.
- Perhaps this is beyond the potential for amendments but I am not content with terminology for parking being assumed as for cars only. For example BES4: "...when it can be shown that the expected extra parking demand..." is assumed to be car parking. But in not specifying this, it fails to acknowledge that bicycle parking and the demand for it exists and should be encouraged.

Suggested modifications or improvements to built environment policies:

- Policy BES1: I suggest splitting out "Proposals will only be supported where the design seeks to minimise opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour." into its own individual policy, because this is largely unrelated to the other matters covered in policy BES1.

Policy BES4: I suggest revising text "Development that would involve the net loss of residential floor space or residential units of any family housing will be resisted.", which currently resists any conversion from family housing (C3) to an HMO (C4 or Sui Generis)

or indeed any other use class, to instead specifically address conversion into an HMO where a relevant density threshold is exceeded, in line with BES4's stated purpose.

- HMO restrictions should be for HMOs with 4 beds not 7, lowering the threshold.

Building conservation restrictions should be expanded from pre-1800 to pre-1900.

More needs to be done to improve the quality and appearance of post-war housing, and their surroundings.

Litter is a real issue and more litter picking is needed.

Transport and Connectivity policies

TCS1: Reducing additional car journeys

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	4	33.33%
Support with modifications	2	16.67%
Oppose	4	33.33%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

TCS2: Net improvements in connectivity

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	7	58.33%
Support with modifications	2	16.67%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

TCC1: Safe Travel

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	6	50.00%
Support with modifications	4	33.33%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

TCC2: Cowley Branch Line

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	10	83.33%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

TCC3: Access to Cowley Centre

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	8	66.67%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

TCC4: Air and Noise Pollution

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	6	50.00%
Support with modifications	2	16.67%
Oppose	2	16.67%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

TCC5: Improved Bus Services

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	10	83.33%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

TCC6: Discouraging through traffic

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	6	50.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	4	33.33%
Other comment	0	0.00%
Not Answered	2	16.67%

Additional Comments:

- Please open Crowell road ANPR LTN to cars.
You can make Crowell road a school street scheme closed only 8.10-9am and 2.30-3.30pm like <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-and-transport/school-streets/location-school-streets>
- To be able to reduce the use of the private motor vehicle by our staff and patients improvements will need to be made to the public transport infrastructure available in the parish. Additional services will need to be provided, particularly from the surrounding towns and villages to enable easy access to our healthcare facilities.
- For TCS1, I would hope that seeking new parking provision will not be supported, with the only supported provision being disabled spaces supported by justification.

For TCC1, I would be keen to see Oxford Rd noted with regards to additional infrastructure to support safe crossing. Could be a useful opportunity to highlight links to Vision Zero commitment in this policy.

- Strongly support the Cowley branch line and better bus connections.
- see previous comments about public transport links.. also

I'd also really appreciate a lot more cycle hangars (like they have in Jericho) and car club spaces located in littlemore-- it would help people use their cars less if there was secure cycle parking undercover and other options such as car club hire. Voi scooters and lime bikes will only help so much.

- Cars are not the enemy, they are essential parts of the modern world. Many of your policy ideas are using old thinking and ignore the transition to electric vehicles and likely changes in vehicle ownership.

Suggested modifications or improvements to transport and connectivity policies:

- Please open Crowell road ANPR LTN to cars.
You can make Crowell road a school street scheme closed only 8.10-9am and 2.30-3.30pm like <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-and-transport/school-streets/location-school-streets>
- More regular bus services and the re-opening of the Cowley Branch Line.
- Policy TCC3 should not include the general public ("Littlemore Residents") to access Cowley Centre via the Crowell Road / Littlemore Road LTN traffic filter. They can use active travel, public transport or the main roads as an alternative.

This policy statement contradicts the plan’s desire to reduce through traffic in the Littlemore area (TCS1) by suggesting Littlemore residents gaining the right for more through traffic in the adjoining Cowley neighbourhood.

- Would like to see more frequent 3A and 5A bus services, and can they go to the train station?
- The most effective means of controlling car ownership would be effective parking control limiting the number of cars per household with rigorous enforcement of parking regulations.

Health and Well being Policies

HWS1: Primary health care facilities

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	8	66.67%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	1	8.33%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

HWC1: Fostering community cohesion

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	7	58.33%
Support with modifications	2	16.67%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

HWC2: Enhancing the safety of the community

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	9	75.00%
Support with modifications	0	0.00%
Oppose	0	0.00%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

HWC3: Addressing poverty and health inequality

Responses	Total	Percent
Support	7	58.33%
Support with modifications	1	8.33%
Oppose	1	8.33%
Other comments	0	0.00%
Not Answered	3	25.00%

Additional comments:

- Fully support a new GP and dentist - could it be run from the Littlemore Community Centre or a school site?

Suggested modifications or improvements to health and wellbeing policies:

- I'd like to see more visual police presence and tighter rules around dangerous dogs, especially if there is to be increased elderly housing

Comments on Littlemore NDP appendices or supporting documents:

- Do you really listen to the people at all.
Recent evidence on past consultations appears to on the contrary. Not very democratic.
- The Neighbourhood Map
The map used in the neighbourhood plan contains inaccuracies.
The Lawn Upton Estate is shown situated on a public road and having a short footpath. Neither is the case.
Further, Lawn Upton Close is a gated community which the map fails to show.
I am reliably informed the map used is some 8 - 9 years old and the significance of these errors is of little importance.
However, for the avoidance of any doubt in the future these errors should be noted and the map amended before the map is officially attached to Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan.