

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
Miscellaneous:				
Page 2, para. 1.2.1	County boundary change in '74 not '73.	Individual.	Agreed	Date to be corrected
Page 2, para. 1.2.1 and 1.2.2	Additional historic information on the Parish would be welcomed, similar to that included in the Character Assessment.	Historic England.	The level of historic information is considered sufficient for the Plan itself. The Character Assessment is part of the evidence base supporting the Plan and is considered the best place for more detail.	No action.
Page 4 Map 1.2	Brookes campus incorrectly designated.	Brookes University.	Map correct. Same designation as other educational establishments.	No action.
Page 4 Map 1.2	Land in N H Village alongside A34 is incorrectly shown as in the Green Belt (cf. Local Plan Adopted Policies map).	Individual.	Advised by VOWHDC that this map is correct but the VOWHDC map is being corrected to show this area of land as still in the Green Belt.	No action.
Page 5, para. 1.2.5	Two bullet points considered either misleading or lacking evidence.	Cumnor Parish Council.	The overall points being made are considered accurate, however the wording could be clearer.	Wording to be revised to clarify the points being made.
Page 6, para. 1.3	Disagree that there has been sufficient consultation, specifically with Brookes University.	Brookes University.	Disagree with this statement. A senior member of Brookes staff was invited to join the Steering Group for this Plan, but only attended the initial meeting where the Steering Group was set up. Over the following two years input was sought and obtained on the Vision/Objectives and on the early draft of the leisure facilities support document amongst other aspects. OBU had been invited to all the consultation events held in Seacourt Hall where the draft documents were on display with information boards inviting feedback, and a member of OBU had attended at least two of these. The Draft Plan was made available during the consultations and meetings had been held with the then serving Director of Estates and Registrar on the	No action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			emerging Policy BU1 and other relevant elements of the Plan.	
Page 8, para. 2.1	The Vision should contain a reference to the health and wellbeing of residents, and those working in or visiting the Parish.	Oxfordshire County Council.	Agreed.	Text amended to include a statement on health and wellbeing.
Page 14 onwards, section 4	Revised 2018 NPPF now adopted so references to the former version should be removed.	VOWHDC	Agreed.	Text to be amended for all topics where the NPPF is referenced.
Page 54 onwards, para. 5.2	A number of the Community Actions where NHPC is responsible for implementation will require a budget to carry out effectively.	Individual.	If NHPC accepts responsibility for those Community Actions it will also decide what level of funds should be applied to each task (if any), and will need to provide that funding, as money obtained for the production of this Plan cannot be transferred for later use in its implementation.	No action.
Housing:				
Page 8, para. 2.2.1	Should say 'attractive and affordable, not just 'attractive'.	Individual.	Last sentence of that paragraph already mentions affordability. It doesn't need to be repeated.	No action.
Page 15, para. 4.1.3(a)	Querying lack of new sites allocated for housing despite Objectives, and the area being a sustainable location.	Oxford University.	Areas can be considered sustainable without containing any significant sized plots of undeveloped land that are suitable for housing, as occurs in this Parish. There is not an infinite supply of land, and following recent major housing developments it is considered that no further plots are available here for the reasons stated in the Plan, which is in line with the Local Plan. This will not block housing growth through the placement of new housing as infill or redevelopment on sites already occupied by housing, as already occurs on a regular basis.	No action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
Section 4	The word 'permanent' should be added before 'affordable' throughout.	Individual.	Agreed for most instances.	'Permanent' to be added in all cases where appropriate.
Section 4	There should be a preference for community led housing, and reference made to the nearby Dean Court Project as an example.	Individual.	Supporting text stating that community led housing is supported could be added, including the suggested reference.	Add supporting text as stated.
Section 4	More information on the Conservation Area should be included, and a more detailed character appraisal and management plan considered.	Historic England.	Agree that more information could be included, however a more detailed appraisal and development of a management plan are the responsibility of VOWHDC – see Core Policy 39.	Further information on the Conservation Area to be added.
Page 19, para. 4.1.5	A policy on affordable housing should be added.	Individual.	Earlier drafts of the Plan contained a policy on affordable housing, but this was removed on the advice of VOWHDC, as it mostly repeated Core Policy 24 of the Local Plan, and where it diverged from that it was deemed in conflict with the Local Plan, rather than adding local detail, which would have led to it failing basic conditions.	No action.
Page 19, para. 4.1.5	A policy encouraging landowners to offer land first for community led housing projects should be added.	Individual.	Supporting text stating that community led housing is supported could be added, but no way can be seen to add an appropriate policy that would have any practical effect.	Add supporting text as stated.
Policy HS1	Should not encourage on-street parking.	Individual x 2.	Agreed.	The phrase 'on-street' has been removed.
Policies HS1 & HS2	Suggested rewording and possible combining of these two policies, including addition of the phrase "only be permitted ...", change 'Botley' to 'North Hinksey Parish', and apply to all development, not just housing.	Historic England.	Agree change of 'Botley' to 'North Hinksey Parish'. Disagree that these policies should be applied to commercial developments as well as many elements do not apply to those sites.	Change wording of policy as stated.
Policy HS2	Wording on density needs consideration.	VOWHDC.	Agree that clarification needed as to exactly which the area is where a higher level of housing	Amend Policy text to clarify the relevant area.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			density would be encouraged, and ensure that this does not conflict with other requirements by specific Character Area.	
Policy HS2	Propose increasing density levels.	Individual.	Density range has been set to reflect the current position, and requirements for housing to be in character with the surroundings, but also to allow a slight increase in density above current maximum levels within certain areas. A further increase would not be considered appropriate	No action.
Policy HS2	Propose splitting out density section as a separate policy. Also unsure whether the density range is appropriate.	Individual.	Agree on splitting policy into two. Density levels are based on the minimum (as set by the VOWHDC) up to a level slightly (less than 10%) over the maximum currently in place.	Split Policy HS2 into two policies, now HS2 and HS3.
Policy HS3	Unclear what the phrases 'facilities to allow homeworking' and 'flexible and adaptable spaces' mean in practice.	Individual.	In addition to technological aspects which are also listed separately, this includes spaces that can be adapted easily for use as an office, storage and physical work spaces etc. that would enable a wide variety of homeworking / teleworking jobs to be carried out from home, with minimal if any restructuring of the building being necessary.	No action.
Policy HS3, and para. 4.1.4	Independence for elderly living at home, possible inclusion of carers as key workers.	Oxfordshire County Council.	Agreed.	Wording of 4.1.4 amended including carers in definition.
Policy HS3	Officer advice on low carbon that it should be encouraged, not required.	VOWHDC.	This policy only 'requires' adherence to two other policies in the Plan, with other elements 'strongly encouraged', not 'required'. As long as Policy UT2 adds further support evidence to meet the basic conditions no changes are required to this Policy.	No action.
Policy HS4	Query what the phrase 'local area' actually means here.	Oxford University.	'Local area' meaning North Hinksey Parish in this context.	Wording amended to clarify intended area.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
Policy HS4	Some specific small sites should be allocated for self-build or community owned / CLT type schemes.	Individual.	Whilst the Plan would support these type of schemes in general, no appropriate sites have been identified for housing of any type, so it is not possible to allocate on this basis.	No action.
Policy HS5, and Section 2.2.	Suggested rewording of policy, with developments to conserve or enhance Conservation Area character and appearance. Similarly heritage assets as a whole, possibly with a specific objective for this.	Historic England.	The wording used in this feedback strongly correlates with that already included in the VOWHDC Local Plan Core Policy 39, and it is not considered necessary to replicate that in this Plan. Further supporting text and a listing of locally important buildings (as shown against other feedback) should suffice.	No action.
Policy HS5	Policy could be superseded by future Local Plan policies.	VOWHDC.	Further advice obtained that clarifies the situation where land removed from the Green Belt would result in additional detailed urban design principles being imposed for that land by the VOWHDC that would supersede any Policy in this Plan. Agree that a revision of text is required to influence the content of the relevant urban design principles rather than being applied by this Plan directly.	Amend Policy text to reflect requirements.
Economy & Employment:				
Page 21 Table 4,2	Site CS1 should mention the hotel.	Individual.	Accepted.	Updated.
Page 26, para 4.2.3	Limit access to unhealthy food to improve health (e.g. policy restricting fast food outlets near schools).	Oxfordshire County Council.	We don't have a large number of fast food outlets and there is a suggestion that the community would like some more. We don't think this would be permissible as a planning policy. It is debatable if any of our businesses site would be considered as near a school.	No Action.
Policy EE1	Unclear. How can new developments 'seek to futureproof developments'. Also 'flexible design' conflicts with 'single business identity'.	Individual.	This plan seeks to develop a professional service business identity to the Area. It feedback received wanted planners to embrace the promotion of a SMART business strategy for the	No Action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			<p>area in line with the stated goals laid out in the strategic plans for the area (such as the Oxford City Deal). It was thought by people in the area the we should however build on what we already had as opposed to invent a new hence why we are proposing a professional services hub (we have lots of those types of businesses already). It is recognised that certain facilities do need to be improved or maintained. For example, poor transport links into the city remain a major obstacle to develop of the business sites. Therefore if a planning proposal undermines any these fundamentals that are needed for the wider viability of the area then the proposal should be rejected. Flexibility of design is important because we know that the future use and value of buildings is going to change. For example hyperstores are not viable options for future supermarkets - the space is too large. Future telecommunication technology will be very important to future business tenants. Environmental considerations due to climate change must be designed into the buildings. If planning applicants do not demonstrate how their proposal seeks to support the overall vision for the area and how future challenges and opportunities might be embraced the application should be rejected.</p>	
Policy EE1, CAEE2	Uncomfortable with term 'single business identity'. Encourage smart businesses, but aim should be for a vibrant, mixed economy and small,	Individual.	We believe the Employment and Economy section does promote a vibrant and mixed economy offering employment for people with a broad range of skills in multiple market sectors. We discuss in this section what the primary	No Action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
	local businesses. Can't dictate which businesses move here.		business identity should be (professional services) and we go onto discuss the need for various support businesses that are needed to support the activities of the primary businesses and their employees. We think these support businesses also support the needs of the local community. Because the community is more likely to access these support businesses at different times to local employees, we believe the sustainability of the business sites are improved.	
Policy EE2	Superfast communications should be more clearly defined. Take into account Future Telecoms Infrastructure Review.	Individual.	<p>New wording for EE2 bullet point about superfast broadband:</p> <p>‘Ensure acceptable provision of superfast communications from the outset as defined by the new national telecoms strategy drawn up by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport in their Future Telecoms Infrastructure Review (or any subsequent superseding Government guidelines or legislation). This strategy includes a target for all of the UK to have full-fibre broadband coverage by 2033.’</p> <p>We are also seeking to add a reference to the government telecom strategy review:</p> <p>‘Government Telecom Infrastructure Review There is a national strategy that seeks to upgrade Telecom infrastructure across the country that this plan seeks to make developers and planners aware of. Detail can be found at the following URL:</p>	Revised wording to Policy and additional support text.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/future-telecoms-infrastructure-review	
Policy EE2	Unclear. What does 'promote business clustering' mean?	Individual.	Business clustering is an approach where businesses operating in a similar market collocate with each other. It creates centres of excellence and makes it easier to promote the area to a wide range of clients. Funding is targeted to develop the awareness in clients minds that they can go to one location and find all the services they need. It helps employees when setting up home if you know there is a collection of potential employers in one area.	No Action.
Policy EE3	Refer to previous officer advice.	VOWHDC.	<p><u>Issue 1: Policy repeats a number of strategic policies of the Local Plan.</u></p> <p>Feedback is noted. The group believe that the inclusion of references to strategic policies add clarity to this policy, and ensure the potential for conflict to occur is minimised.</p> <p>No additional comment required</p> <p><u>Issue 2: Concerns about the effectiveness and enforceability of part of the policy relating to change of use on sites CS2 to CS12.</u></p> <p>Feedback is noted.</p> <p>In addition to earlier noted feedback we offer further clarification and say: Whilst we recognise the legal difficulties of enforcing the requirements associated with limited time leases etc in this policy, we are not actually saying that a development must include those requirements to be acceptable. We are</p>	<p>The statement in core policy EE3:</p> <p>'Ancillary Uses will be supported on 'sites for business use' in accordance with the requirements of Core Policy 29 and Development Policy 10'</p> <p>Will be removed and the following statement will be added to the main body of the text</p> <p>'Ancillary Uses will be supported on 'sites for business use' in accordance with the requirements of Core Policy 29 and emerging Development</p>

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			<p>saying the provision of such facilities in a new development proposal would be desirable and should be encouraged. The policy as it stands is designed to help planners as much as it is meant to guide developers. We seek to ensure that these facilities, which we know have been identified by potential local business tenants and the Economic Development officers at the Vale of White Horse as desirable, are not forgotten in the future when planning proposals are discussed. The policy merely asks developers to fulfil the requirements of one or more of the requirements listed. Planners would be encourage to support planning applications more vigorously if more than one of the requirements identified in this policy were demonstrated in a proposal. We imagine that even if proposals do satisfy one of more of the requirements laid done in the policy, it would not necessarily mean the proposal overall would pass planning scrutiny and be granted planning permission. The task of balancing and weighting the impact and merit of various aspects of a specific proposal are obviously considered by planners and councillors at the time of application and are specific to the proposal presented.</p> <p><u>Issue 3: Part of the policy needs to be in general conformity with Core Policy 29: Change of use of Existing Employment Land and Premises</u> Feedback is noted.</p>	<p>Policy 10. The location of North Hinksey Parish with its close proximity to Oxford and central location within the Oxford City Deal's Knowledge Spine and the fact the the communication and transport infrastructure supporting the area is very likely to be improved beyond the above average provision that already exists means that developers would need an overwhelming and compelling case to demonstrate that there is no prospect of continued employment on any of our business sites. That is the case whether they are strategic (as defined in the local plan) or otherwise in nature'</p>

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			<p>In addition to earlier noted feedback we offer further clarification and say: Our policy EE3 does reference CP29 and emerging DP10 and says we should be in general conformance. However, we would expect planners to set a very high threshold when considering if the sites are not viable as business sites because of the proximity of North Hinksey to Oxford and its central location within the Oxford City Deal's Knowledge Spine. It would seem very unlikely that a developer would be able to demonstrate that 'there was no reasonable prospect of continued employment use' particularly given the amenities we have identified as supportable in our policies and community actions. The financial value of a site may be undermined by the need to prioritise the site for employment but this is not a consideration in planning decisions. The developer needs to present a persuasive case (including audited proof as described in requirement a) of EE3) as to why their proposal delivers greater economic, social and environmental value if they are seeking a change of use away from employment.</p> <p>After further feedback the action in the 'action to be taken, column will be taken</p>	
Policy EE3	Condition (e) seems to allow the bypassing of the general principle of this policy.	Individual.	One of the central principles of the Economy and Employment section of this plan is to promote productivity improvements. Condition e is specifically related to encouraging developments to make better and more productive use of a	No Action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			business site. We do not want to dig up more green land for construction of business sites. Therefore making better use of existing sites is the best route to encourage growth.	
CAEE1	Should encourage businesses to support each other more, network and share, possibly run a loyalty scheme.	Individual.	Whilst we would agree with the sentiment this is not something that can be defined in a planning document. We can merely encourage the direction of funding and support in the future to embrace and create these kinds of benefits. This is why it is a community action as opposed to a planning policy. We hope that business clustering, a business identity for the area and a good mix of type 1 and 2 businesses will lead to the creation of what the respondent seeks.	No Action.
Transport:				
Section 4.3	Measures to counter air quality problems are not given enough prominence.	Individual.	Agree that it could feature more prominently.	Add to support text.
Section 4.3	The Plan should state support for the B4044 Community Path Project.	Individual x 2.	Although this Community Path is outside of the Parish further wording could be added to the support text that is generally supportive of this path and linking to the wider cycle network as a whole.	Add to support text.
Page 28, para. 4.3.1	Missing reference to bus service S1.	Oxfordshire County Council.	Agreed.	Add reference.
Policy TR1 / TR2	Suggested rewordings (including removal of 300m limit, infrastructure near schools and electric bike charging) and querying type of secure cycle storage.	Oxfordshire County Council and noted by VOWHDC.	Agree that 300m limit should be removed. Agree on adding electric bike charging. "Secure bicycle storage" definition considered too prescriptive. "Contribute to/deliver where appropriate"	Change wording. Text to be added. No change Change wording.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
			Contribution to public transport services from all new developments. Agreed.	
Policy TR1	Suggested rewording of policy querying 300m distance as inappropriate.	Oxford University.	N Hinksey has a large number of over 60's. See above comment from County Council on removal of 300m limit.	No further change.
Policy TR2	Suggested rewording on location of electric vehicle charging points.	Oxfordshire County Council and noted by VOWHDC.	Agreed.	Change to "Make provision for charging electric vehicles within the curtilages of dwellings"
Policy TR2	Suggested rewording of policy adding phrase about 'any other standards'.	Oxford University.	Do not agree with the proposal. This invites developers to find the laxest standard possible.	No change
Policy TR3	Add A420 / West Way junction.	Individual.	The wording was intended to cover this junction but will be amended to clarify.	Change wording to describe in more detail.
Policy TR4	Difficult to support without knowing details of local plans for the Rapid Transit Network.	Cumnor Parish Council.	This is an opinion of Cumnor PC, but we consider it appropriate to include this reference to the RTN.	No change
CATR1	Need to mention the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.	Individual.	Agreed, plus also a mention of the East-West Rail, which should influence the need for the Expressway would be a helpful addition.	Add "and the proposed Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and East-West Rail"
CAET1	Suggested rewording 'to County Council standards.'	Oxfordshire County Council.	Suggest "Improvements to cycle routes and bike parking, preferably that conform to Oxfordshire County Council walking and cycling standards"	Replace existing wording
Map D1 (Appendices)	Misleading as it excludes some bus routes. Suggest renaming it.	Oxfordshire County Council.	Para 4.3.1 needs updating: service X30 is now called S9. Before "Service 6.." add "Service S1 runs to Eynsham, Witney and Carterton up to 4 times/hr, linking N.Hinksey with schools in Eynsham" The map needs re-drawing: the routes mentioned are shown, but only to Arnolds Way. The impression is given that there are also direct routes to N.Oxford and along the Abingdon Road	Update para 4.3.1 Revise map and heading "Bus routes through the Parish and central Oxford"

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
Social Infrastructure:				
Page 32, para 4.4.1	Suggest mentioning health benefits of social interaction / reduced isolation to support proposals for youth facilities and indoor space for community activities.	Oxfordshire County Council.	Agreed.	Supporting text to be added to para. 4.4.1.
Section 4.4	Suggest production of a listing of historical and other locally important buildings and features.	Historic England.	Agree that this would be of use as part of the evidence base.	Listing to be produced, plus some supporting text added.
Section 4.4	Suggest survey of condition of Grade II listed buildings.	Historic England.	Not considered urgent or particularly relevant to this Plan. Also see Local Plan Core Policy 39.	No action.
Section 4.4	Highlight importance of early phasing of amenities within major developments.	Oxfordshire County Council.	Agreed.	Supporting text added to section 4.4.1.
Policy SI1	Should be more detailed and proactive in identifying ways of overcoming any shortfall in facilities, particularly leisure.	Individual.	This Plan can protect facilities and encourage expansion of them, but it is not an effective tool for identifying shortfalls in detail and overcoming them. Actions being taken by NHPC and other bodies are already carrying out those actions outside of formal planning legislation.	No action.
Policy SI1	Concern over use of the phrase 'ancillary and complimentary' which could allow loss of facilities.	Individual.	Ancillary definition 'Providing necessary support to the primary activities or operation of an organization, system, etc.', complimentary definition 'providing assistance in order to achieve an overall objective'. This phrase is also used in the Local Plan, and was recommended by VOWHDC after discussions in order to meet the aims of the policy. Not considered a potential problem.	No action.
Policy SI1 and Leisure Facilities Review.	Policy states local needs and accessible for all which conflicts with subjective statements in the support	Individual.	The Provision of Leisure Facilities document supports the need for policies offering protection, and supporting appropriate	No action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
	document (e.g. 8.6 of Review on lack of suitable youth facilities). Review section 7.4.1 should refer to Brookes facilities. Reference to several hundred signatories on the skatepark petition is vague and misleading. Reference to an out of date 2008 VOWHDC report.		expansion of leisure facilities, combined with community actions to identify and overcome shortfalls and does not conflict with the Plan. Section 7.4.1 already refers to the Brookes MUGA in the paragraph before the quoted text. A total of 736 North Hinksey residents signed the petition, so the statement 'several hundred' may have slightly understated the case, but was not particularly misleading. A wide variety of reports from 2008 up to the current time were considered to ensure that a wide range of background information could be included.	
Page 56, para. 5.2.5	Add a Community Action for NHPC to carry out a review of Rights of Way before 2026 to avoid losing those not on the official map.	Individual.	Agreed.	New Community Action CASI4 to be added and previous CA with that number to be renumbered CASI5.
Utilities:				
Page 39, para. 4.5.2	Suggested rewording of text to take account of water and wastewater changes from April 2018.	Thames Water.	Agreed	Text added
Policy UT2	Refer to previous officer advice on need for further evidence to justify the policy.	VOWHDC.	Agreed	Text added
Policy UT2	Suggested rewording of text, removing post construction evidence.	Oxford University.	The suggestion is not sufficiently justified. It is also contrary to independent expert advice given to us	No action
Green Spaces:				
Policy GS1	Local Green Spaces should include the land between Raleigh Park and Brookes Campus, and the upper part of Yarnells Hill (currently part owned by Thames Water and part by the	Individual.	The site does not currently meet the criteria for Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF. The land in question is currently privately owned and inaccessible to the public, although it is understood that its owners are considering its	No further action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
	Warburg Family who have been selling / developing their section).		future. In light of this, if it becomes more publicly accessible and is managed as part of Raleigh Park, then its designation as a Local Green Space may be considered through a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Policy GS1	Local Green Spaces should include the land on the N Hinksey side of Tilbury Fields to the north of Wytham View and the footpath to Hazel Road.	Individual.	Agree to add this public recreation area which was previously overlooked as it has not yet been built / landscaped.	Added as a Local Green Space.
Policies GS1 and GS2, Table G1 in Appendices and Section 4.6 text.	GS1 and GS2 assume that Green Belt sites are fully protected but this provides insufficient protection. Stronger policies if a wider range of sites, and place restrictions on development <u>in the vicinity of</u> wildlife sites and green spaces. They should require no net loss of biodiversity. Also full assessment of ecological and hydrological effects should be required for developments near to Raleigh Park and the Louie Memorial Fen. Raleigh Park should be included in the list of Local Green Spaces. Table G1 and section 4.6 should mention Raleigh Park more fully. It also has the 'rare alkaline fen' habitat (NPPF 'irreplaceable habitat') and together with the	Friends of Raleigh Park.	<p>Unfortunately the concerns raised about the Green Belt policies are outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has confirmed that the concerns go beyond local & national policy including the new NPPF & can't be addressed at Neighbourhood Plan level.</p> <p>The LPA advise that land at or near Raleigh Park and the Fen at Louie Memorial Fields is sufficiently protected by Policy UT1 (see map F.1 of the appendices), which requires investigation of groundwater in the area, as well as the application of buffer zones for protected species in those areas.</p> <p>The LPA advises that sites already designated within Green Belt are not included as it conflicts with national & strategic policy. See also para 4.6.3 of NHP Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>No further action.</p> <p>No further action.</p> <p>No further action.</p>

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
	Louie Memorial Fen these make up the two main local wildlife sites.		As above, Raleigh Park is not a designated Local Green Space as it has the greater designation of being in the Green Belt. The purpose of the NP is to identify green spaces that don't currently have protection under other designation.	No further action.
Policy GS2	Concern over use of the phrase 'where possible'.	Individual.	Phrasing is in adherence to LPA guidelines.	No further action.
Policy GS3	Suggested rewording querying use of the word 'limited' as being vague, and possibly replacing 'requested' with 'identified'.	Individual plus Historic England.	Referred to LPA Senior Planning Officer who agreed with the suggestions made on & provided new wording on behalf of the LPA.	Policy GS3 amended.
Policy GS3	Suggest remove policy as ill conceived and prohibits development too much. If not then suggest views reviewed thoroughly and do not use subjective descriptions.	Individual.	Feedback from community is that there are many views around the Parish that are valued & significant. It's incorrect to say that the policy prohibits development, the policy ensures that full assessments are carried out so that impacts on views are considered as part of the planning process, see also response to Historic England submission. Whilst there is a recognised element of subjectivity, the working group used an established methodology to assess views as suggested by the Landscape Officer at the VOWHDC. The approach compliments current planning policy & practice. The whole Neighbourhood Plan including the valued views will be reviewed periodically, as part of local planning practice.	No further action.
Policy GS3 and Map G4.	The inclusion of view cone VP11 was questioned.	Brookes University.	The justification for its inclusion is that one or more parishioners have identified it as a valued view. The assessment of this view can be found in Table G2, Appendices.	No further action.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
<p>Policy GS3 and Map G4.</p>	<p>Suggested revisions to views listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More views of the Oxford spires from Elms Rise should be added. • More views from Elms Rise towards Wytham Woods should be added. • Views VP2 / VP3 could be reduced to just VP2. VP3 doesn't add anything. • Views VP5 / VP9 could be reduced to a single double-width view cone. Also the descriptions don't currently seem to match exactly with the two views and it is difficult to work out which is which on the map. Plus a similar view from the top of the playing fields is equally important. • A view cone from the middle of the field south of Grosvenor Road on Harcourt Hill (owned by Oxford Preservation Trust) looking towards the Oxford spires should be added. 	<p>Individuals (various).</p>	<p>There are conflicting views about the number of viewpoints from Elms Rise over the city and Wytham, some saying too many, some not enough, so we feel that the current array is sufficient, but can be reviewed when the NP is reviewed.</p> <p>The Working Group re-visited the viewpoint locations and reviewed that VP2 takes in the same & more than VP3. As changes to the VP3 view would also affect VP2 but not wholly vice versa, VP2 will be retained and VP3 discarded.</p> <p>The map is small when viewed in hardcopy, but when used with the table G2, the direction of view & description are clearly explained.</p> <p>First time in this process that this view has been identified as of value. The Working Group visited the viewpoint & assessed it was not significantly different to the view from the top of the Lower LM Fields, and will not be included at this time.</p> <p>First time in this process that this view has been identified as of value. The Working Group visited the viewpoint & assessed it was significantly different to other views and will be added.</p> <p>First time in this process that this view has been identified as of value. The Working Group visited the viewpoint & assessed it was significantly different to other views and will be added.</p>	<p>No further action.</p> <p>The text, map & assessment documents will be amended to delete VP3.</p> <p>No further action</p> <p>No further action</p> <p>View will be added to text, map & assessment documents.</p> <p>View will be added to text, map & assessment documents.</p>

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A view cone looking towards the north east from the footpath on the eastern edge of the Tilbury Fields Estate should be added. • In addition to view cone VP12 there are better views of Elms Rise to the south from Hazel Road, and over the Seacourt Road bungalows from Murdoch Place in the Tilbury Fields Estate. • Objection to the inclusion of the view of the golf course (VP13). 		<p>The Working Group visited Murdoch Place & Hazel Road viewpoints & agree that the range of viewpoints towards Elms Rise offers differing views & this can be reflected in the description about VP12.</p> <p>Hillside comprising golf course is part of this wide landscape view, the description does not claim that it is a natural feature.</p>	<p>Viewpoints will be incorporated to VP12 & appendix updated</p> <p>Text amended.</p>
Map G4 in Appendices	Incorrect identification of Lower and Upper Playing Fields (SRA1 and SRA2).	VOWHDC.	Agreed	Corrected.
Brookes University Harcourt Hill Campus:				
Section 4.7 text and Policy BU1	Overall major conflicts with NPPF and the Local Plan. Suggestion that the Plan therefore fails to meet the Basic Conditions Test as currently written.	Brookes University.	Matter being resolved through further discussions with Oxford Brookes University.	Inclusion of Oxfordshire County Council site development boundaries plan as Appendices Map H.1 to define the boundary.
Policy BU1	Building on the Green Belt should not restrict plans for development of the Campus to the current built footprint.	Brookes University.	Matter being resolved through further discussions with Oxford Brookes University.	Inclusion of Oxfordshire County Council site development boundaries plan as Appendices Map H.1 to define the boundary.

Policy/Page no. etc	Submission comments	Organisation / Individual	Response to submission	Action to be taken
Policy BU1	Querying transport issues, use of 20% increase in student numbers as an appropriate level and use of S106 funds for road and pavement maintenance.	Brookes University.	Matter being resolved through further discussions with Oxford Brookes University.	Transport issues linked to increased usage of the site. See also Policy TR!. Condition i. changed to reinstatement of adjacent roads to condition before development.
Policy BU1	Refer to previous officer advice.	VOWHDC.	Matter being resolved through further discussions with Oxford Brookes University.	Dealt with in proposed changes above.