

**Responses to the Public Consultation Summer 2024 on Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan sent direct to the Clerk/Chair of NPWG (ie not via or in addition to via website) and responses to these (in right hand column)**

<b>Name of respondent</b>	<b>Overall response</b>	<b>Specific areas/policies (page numbers refer to draft for consultation)</b>	<b>Key points</b>	<b>Decision on altering wording and if so where and how?</b>
<b>Natural England</b>	No specific comment	None	Recommend seeking specialist advice if need be	Noted- will do as and when required.
<b>Oxford Science Park</b>	Broadly supportive	The history, character, and identity of Littlemore page 7	Want NP to support OSP's key role and continued development of land for employment use.	Key role already highlighted. Nothing specific added as land already approved for development and including this might conflict with views of residents.
		Vision and Objectives pp 16/17	Align with 2040 Plan to have enough sites for housing in Littlemore.	Since there aren't any major ones except Kassam site, and it does align with draft 2040 plan, no addition made, except addition/change of wording on page 19.
		TCC2 (Cowley Branch Line - CBL))	Support but strengthen to add support for area around station to a multi modal hub.	Strengthened especially in TCC2 and supporting text
		NES2	Clarify location of nature reserve. Concern re/objection to 15% biodiversity requirement.	Clarified on page 28 (text before NES2) 15% gain not seen as a requirement but wording altered slightly in NES2.
<b>National Highways</b>	No comments	Remit to do with Strategic Road Network (A34)		None needed.
<b>Historic England</b>	No specific comments at this stage			None needed.

<b>Rail Pen</b>	Supportive -no comments			None needed (though slight update of text to reflect their planning application).
<b>Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust</b>	Broadly supportive	Vision and Objectives	Housing should take account of key workers and long stay patients.	Key workers already included. Long stay patients thought to be too specific in Vision and Objectives.
		General	Support 1) development of businesses bringing jobs into local area, 2) protect open spaces and enhance biodiversity, 3) travel alternatives to reduce car travel 4) BES1 5) better bus services, opening of CBL and improvements for cyclists.	Noted and used where other comments requested similar changes.
		NE section	Don't support proposal for blanket 15% gain in biodiversity.	15% gain not seen as a requirement but wording altered slightly in NES2.
		NES2	Further discussion on protection of green spaces around Littlemore Mental Health Centre (LMHC) especially if any are to be designated as wildlife habitats.	Noted but no need to change as designation of green spaces/local wildlife habitats not proceeded with at this stage.
		Accompanying HWS1 Page 34	Suggest rewording of description of LMHC.	Mostly adopted (with slight changes) on page 7.
<b>Network Rail</b>	Only on TCC2	TCC2	Support sustainable travel and CBL. Need to close Mallam level crossing and upgrade Spring Lane Increase of traffic using crossings should lead to refusal unless safety not compromised.	Noted.  Noted and small addition to TCC2 and accompanying text.

<b>Thames Valley Police</b>		BES1 Public safety and crime prevention	Suggest strengthening BES1 not permitting developments that do not design out crime- residential as well as community and commercial.	'Developments that do not sufficiently design out crime will not be supported' added to BES1.
		TCS1	Urge requirement for secure cycling infrastructure.	'Proposals will be expected to provide sufficient secure, conveniently located cycle storage.' added to TCS1.
<b>NHS B, O and BW</b>	Supportive except on HWS1	Vision and Objectives	Support especially improved and new infrastructure, include primary health care facilities.	Noted and welcomed.
		BES1	Willing to work with LPC and others to explore opportunity for mixed use community facility including primary healthcare provision, but it must be affordable and operationally viable.	Noted and welcomed. No change thought to be needed to BES1 but see below in terms of HWS1.
		HWS1	Suggests lengthy addition related to regulations, process and saying that it must be operationally and financially viable and that 'The delivery of the facility shall be funded by developer contribution and the provision, and any contractual arrangement of the facility shall be agreed and secured by a Section 106 agreement in any forthcoming planning applications.'	Additions on regulations and process thought not to be necessary, as largely self-evident. <recognizing that these must be operationally and financially viable> added to accompanying text to HWS1. Sentence in column to the left starting 'The delivery..' not included as it would in practice make achieving this almost certainly impossible and running counter to the intention of the Plan.
<b>Resident 1</b>			Preserve green spaces. More/better cycle paths.	Noted and welcomed. Greater emphasis on cycling in revised draft.

<b>Resident 2</b>	Very positive		<p>Do stats on p10 include clients/residents at LMHC i.e. drug and alcohol? CIS1 ?include British Legion.</p> <p>CIS2 'tree' sculpture on village green lowers tone- ?remove/ improve. CIS2 -add cars to walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>NES4 ? 3 sets of allotments. NEC3 add 'improve tree' i.e. sculpture as above in comment on CIS2. TCC1 suggest bollards opposite Cowley Rd shops to prevent pavement parking. Better lighting in Newman Rd .</p>	<p>Not known, but not thought appropriate to alter publicly available statistics.</p> <p>Not thought to be appropriate in CIS1 but included already in CIS2. Thought to be too specific and not mentioned by any other respondents.</p> <p>Not added as CIS2 and other policies are intended to encourage use of other means of travel than cars. Current text thought to be accurate. As above in comment on CIS2.</p> <p>More general wording on these lines added to accompanying text of TCC1.</p> <p>Improvements in lighting called for, but this not added as not regarded as a greater priority than elsewhere.</p>
<b>Oxford Stem Tech</b>			<p>Need for walkways between Science Park and surrounds e.g. Sainsbury's, Mogridge Drive and Sandford Rd, to reduce walking distance and time, access to buses and helping Science Park achieve carbon goals.</p>	<p>Addition on these lines made to accompanying text to TCS2.</p>

<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b>	Several responses in separate sections below			
Strategic planning		TCC2 (on Cowley BL)  HWC1	<p>Areas intended for designation as green spaces/wildlife habitats should have been included. OCC would object to designating any new nature reserve where the land is under their ownership and managed for public benefit or delivering functions such as education.</p> <p>Welcome TCC2 and improving pedestrian and cycle access to stations.</p> <p>Strongly encourage reference to Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) and Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP).</p> <p>Supportive in principle of improved community access to school facilities, but is not within remit of an NPlan.</p> <p>Welcome reference to energy efficient retrofitting in line with OCC Climate Action Framework.</p> <p>Suggest NES3 refers to OCC 'Tree Policy to Oxfordshire'.</p>	<p>Noted, but, since designation of these is postponed, no need to include these at this stage.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Agreed and referred to (page 32).</p> <p>This is a community policy so can be included, but &lt;where this can be agreed with the appropriate body&gt; included in HWC1.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Agreed and referred to (page 29).</p>

Transport policy		TCS1	TCC should refer to LTCP and COTP. Support TCS1 but should be strengthened to align with LTCP e.g. to reduce car traffic and make other modes of transport first choice. Refer to LTCP transport user hierarchy .	Included as above.  Decided not to alter wording given the strength of feeling in Littlemore, the careful wording of the original and lack of objection otherwise to this wording.  Reference to this thought to be implicit in many statements and no need to make addition. Reference to Vision Zero not thought to be needed. Sentence added in accompanying text to TCC1 re wheelchairs and pushchairs. Here and elsewhere changed to ‘transport/mobility’ hub.
		TCC1	Opportunity to reference OCC commitment to Vision Zero in TCC1 and further consideration to disabled communities.	
		TCC2	Support reference to CBL and transport hubs, but suggest change to ‘mobility hub’.	
		TCC4	Opportunity to refer to OCC Director of Public Health report. Essentially saying existing 7.5 tonnes weight restriction covering all roads in L’more is adequate.	Included under Health and Well-Being page36 rather than TCC4. Thought that while this may be true now, we are looking ahead the next 15 years and this may change.
		TCC6	Suggest TCC6 promotes sustainable last mile delivery options for new developments.	While sympathetic to the sentiment, it was thought that this is usually incorporated in agreements and little development (apart from the Kassam site) is planned, so decided not to include this.
		TCS2	In TCS2 text take out . after difficult	Done.
Public transport		TCC5	Disagree that there have been reductions in bus services. Planned improvements outlined.	Agreed that the text is inaccurate about the current situation, so text amended on page 34. Noted and welcomed, though we are looking longer-term.

Active travel		TCC3	<p>No mention of LTCP or Active Travel, especially targets to increase cycling and reduce car trips. Cycling connections seem to be ignored with no policies. No mention of approved Oxford cycle network- L'more potentially well connected though some routes need improvement.</p> <p>Little in NPlan to support objective 'to improve access...'</p> <p>Should mention need to improve Cottesmore Bridge (to RoseHill) .</p> <p>Object to TCC3 as this is contrary to OCC policy, but support measures to improve bus services and enhance safety of cyclists and enable access for emergency vehicles, blue badge holders, carers and L'more residents.</p> <p>L'more poorly connected to Blackbird Leys centre.</p> <p>Suggest including policy to create viable connections improving E12 (by ring road) &amp; opening E13 (by Kassam stadium).</p>	<p>First point addressed as above. We do not agree that cycling connections are ignored but agree that they can be strengthened and cycle network mentioned and improvements encouraged. Some wording on these lines included on page 33 especially.</p> <p>We do not agree (see e.g. TCC1, TCC3, TCC5).</p> <p>Agreed and added in TCC1.</p> <p>This may be contrary to current County Council policy but there is very strong feeling locally in favour of amending this- and decided to retain the current carefully crafted wording.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Suggestion about viable connections included in accompanying text to TCC1.</p>
Property	4 pages- this only a short summary	CIS1/CIS2	<p>Concern about wording as no clear guidance on what type of evidence required. How much if at all does this add to current City policy CF1? Objects and seeks further clarification.</p>	<p>There does not seem to be a City policy CF1. If it does not add much to an existing policy, it is hard to see why this is objected to. Decided not to change these policies (except slightly in other respects) since they reflect strong feeling locally on the need for improved facilities.</p>

Property continued		CIC2	No evidence given for under-utilisation of facilities at schools. This is outside the remit of NPlan. Schools are mainly for educational use.	Evidence not shown in Plan but emerged from Issues and Options Survey and discussions. Since this is a community policy, it was thought that this can be included.
		HWC1	Repeats comment re schools being mainly for educational use. Propose deleting wording about more access to facilities within Littlemore's schools.	We wish to retain the wording on access to school facilities but agreed to add in HWC1 <where this can be agreed with the appropriate body>
		NES2	Concern re designation of green areas and playing fields associated with Academy as wildlife habitat. Wish to see proposed maps before commenting further but holding objection.  Concern re text on biodiversity-support aspiration but concern if this removes hierarchy. Requirement to exceed 10% requires robust evidence, unclear whether this bar has been reached.	Concern noted, but given the decision to postpone discussions on designation, it was thought this did not require further changes (apart from adding Appendix 3)  Noted. However, as above, NES2 does not <b>require</b> gain of more than 10%, but supports this and requires reasons to be given if not. Evidence includes that from Oxford Local Nature Partnership (see link on page 27) but proposed policy sets out an aspiration and requires reasons where this cannot be met.
Healthy Place Shaping	Mainly supportive	BES1	Comment re possible tension between encouraging physical activity and community safety. Support need for new and improved infrastructure, suggest add <Include outdoor community facilities, e.g. growing spaces, planters and community orchards to encourage social interaction>.	Noted and agreed.  Agreed, but thought best to include this in accompanying text to NEC3 and Health and Well-Being on page 36 (partly because of lack of likely new developments).

<p>Healthy Place Shaping continued</p>		<p>CIS1 CIS2 CIS3 CIC1 (re shops) CIC2 CIC3 NE policies  NEC1  NEC2  TC Section TCS2  TCC4 TCC5 (buses) HWB</p>	<p>Support, recommend developer funding is sought. Strongly support, suggest including activation measures to assist uptake. General comment about developers contributing. Strongly support . Concur. Support. Strongly support -especially climate action, increase biodiversity and improving air quality. Agree but L'more is near to open countryside. Suggest include waymarking and walking and cycling routes, to encourage exploration of rural Oxfordshire. Suggest including reference to improved lighting in parks. Supportive in general. Suggest add need for more secure and easily accessible cycle parking outside business and residential frontages, and wayfinding. Strongly support re pollution. Welcome. Support especially HWS1 and HWC1 and HWC2.</p>	<p>Welcomed, but thought that new developer funding (apart from Kassam site) will be limited. Welcomed in principle, but we did not know what to include, especially since as a strategic policy this would be reactive to proposals. Noted.  Noted and welcomed. Noted and welcomed. Noted and welcomed. Noted and welcomed though also noting that other parts of County Council response question the point on biodiversity.  Agreed on waymarking and walking and cycling routes (added on page 28 and elsewhere), but we thought focus should be mostly on within Littlemore and immediate environs.  Wording strengthened on page 30.  Noted and welcomed. Wording to reflect this included in TCS1.  Noted and welcomed. Noted and welcomed. Noted and welcomed.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Healthy Place Shaping continued			Suggest adding specific policy on mental health and well-being e.g. 'Investments and activities that aim to tackle loneliness, promote mental wellbeing and encourage community cohesion and resilience will be supported.'	Noted and agreed on issue but decided to include wording in HWC1 rather than a separate policy.
Local County Councillor	Strong support			Noted and welcomed.
<b>Oxford City Council</b>	7 pages- only key points here	General	Scale broadly aligned with what's appropriate for an NPlan. Objectives broadly aligned with current and emerging Local Plans-no significant conflicts.	Noted and welcomed.
		Timetable	Could be examined against 2036 or 2040 Plan depending on when 2040 Plan is adopted.	Subsequent discussion led to decision to try and align with both, but formally to do so with 2036 Plan.
		BES1 (should say BES2)	Local Plan has not identified additional need. Assessed city-wide.	Addition made to BES2 to reflect this.
		BES4	Does not align with 2036, 2040 or national policy definitions very specific and can't be re-interpreted.	Recognizing this, decision was made to retain BES4 but also to add BEC1 on similar lines in case BES4 is deemed non-compliant.
		BES5	Suggest referring to 'heritage assets and their settings' Refer to Conservation Area Appraisal. Add any assets to Oxford Heritage Asset Register (OHAR)?	Amended to 'historic and heritage assets and their settings'. This is referred to earlier in the Plan and a reference added on page 19. Decision made that this is not feasible at this stage but could be investigated further.

<b>Oxford City Council continued</b>		BES6	Retrofitting not just external visible installations. Refer to guidance TAN15.	Noted and welcomed. Addition made to BES6.
		CIS1	Aligned with Local Plan objectives. Any evidence to show buildings next to Kassam meet definition and use class as community facilities?	First sentence noted and welcomed. In Appendix 2 of the draft Plan, we have set out our approach to infrastructure and community facilities as a basis for why these buildings (or at least some of them) should be seen as community facilities.
		CIS2	Aligned with Local Plan 2040 objectives. Suggest criteria/ evidence for site to be categorised as community facility. Any evidence on what community facilities are needed?	First sentence noted and welcomed. On the rest, a similar answer to the one above. Given the lack of good facilities in Littlemore, we argue that at the very least those which are there should not be lost (or should be replaced to at least a similar standard).
		CIC3	Aligned with Local Plan objectives. Could highlight specific settings and contexts.	First sentence noted and welcomed. On the second, we think we have done so at least to some extent earlier in the Plan.
		NES1	Potential to be as much spatially focussed as environmental policy. Suggest identifying key characteristics considered locally important eg views, local amenity value, historic significance. Important that designations are applied so as to ensure access not to prevent development.	We were unsure of the implications of this comment, as we saw it as both a spatially focussed policy and an environmental one. Given that we are postponing this work, we have not done this at this stage, but plan to do so in discussion with those who assist with designation to ensure that our proposals are based on the criteria for designation. Please see Appendix 2 of the draft Plan.

<p><b>Oxford City Council continued</b></p>		<p>NES2 (local wildlife habitats)</p>	<p>Quite detailed but basically saying seek advice from Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre. Include rationale/ categories for protection, selection and methodology (e.g. as appendix). Not against more than 10% biodiversity gain as such but needs evidence for setting higher than minimum threshold.</p>	<p>We intend to seek advice from TWERC in due course. Please see Appendix 2 of the draft Plan.</p> <p>Noted, with interest in the light of other opposition to having more than 10% gain. As above (page 8), evidence includes that from Oxford Local Nature Partnership (see link on page 27 of Plan) but proposed policy sets out an aspiration and requires reasons where this cannot be met.</p>
		<p>NES4 (allotments)</p>	<p>May not be necessary as probably covered by Local Plan and national protection.</p>	<p>Noted, but it was thought that mention of allotments should be included to emphasize their importance.</p>
		<p>NEC1</p>	<p>Some duplication with NES1 and NEC2- potential to rationalise. Suggest including rationale and/or categories for protection and methodology assessment and/or audit of each area and opportunities for improvement. Evidence, maps and plans needed Refer to guidance on <a href="#">Making local green space designations in your neighbourhood plan - Locality Neighbourhood Planning</a></p>	<p>Accepted. See under NEC4 below.</p> <p>Given the decision to postpone designation, it was decided at this stage only to outline the current situation and criteria in Appendix 2 of the draft Plan e.g. on the guidance referred. Detail and maps have therefore not been included.</p>

<b>Oxford City Council continued</b>		NEC 2	Suggest identifying opportunities for enhancement.	It was thought that NEC2 gives some general areas for enhancement and that these will need to be dealt with on a case by case basis.
		NEC 4	Potential for rationalisation - similar points to those above. How does this differ from NES1 & NEC1? Hierarchy of protection should be considered.	Decision taken to amalgamate NEC1 and NEC4, but that since strategic policies refer to future development proposals and community ones are more general to keep these separate. This will be considered in future discussions, as outlined in Appendix 2 of the draft Plan.
		TCS1, TCS2, TCC1, TCC3, TCC4, TCC6	All high level/aspirational. Would benefit from rationalisation, focussing on criteria for assessing development proposals. Could be reframed to clarify community actions to support new traffic/highways measures and where developers could contribute towards these.	We considered this but decided that given that transport and connectivity has been such a contentious issue in Littlemore and that there has been so little adverse comment that it would be unwise to alter these significantly. In addition, given the likely difficulty of securing agreement on supporting new traffic/highways measures (apart from aspects such as improved bus services) and lack of large future development proposals (apart from the Kassam site), we decided not to make changes except where specific, largely uncontentious points have been raised by other respondents.
		Conclusion	Additional evidence required in some places to address comments. Policies should be framed to refer to development proposals with clear criteria for how requirements will be met. Need to ensure policies comply with basic conditions.	We hope these have been addressed.  We believe that these have been and that policies comply with basic conditions, as outlined in the Basic Conditions Statement.