



## **The Friends of Old Headington**

*President: Lady Kenny | Vice-President: Dr Sonia Brough*

Chairman of the trustees: Peter McCarter, Monckton Cottage, Old High Street, Oxford OX3 9HW  
E [chairman@foh.org.uk](mailto:chairman@foh.org.uk) T 01865 751471 W [foh.org.uk](http://foh.org.uk)

7 November 2017

Felicity Byrne, Case Officer  
Oxford City Council Planning Team  
St Aldate's Chambers,  
109 St Aldate's,  
Oxford, OX1 1DS

Dear Ms Byrne,

Re 17/02387/FUL | i) Erection of 65 bed student accommodation building on four storeys. ii) Erection of 30 bed student accommodation building on two and three storeys. Demolition of Bowen Building. (additional information and revised plans) | Ruskin Hall Dunstan Road Oxford OX3 9BZ

Since we submitted the views of the trustees of The Friends of Old Headington on this planning application it became apparent that we should reference the Headington Neighbourhood Plan in our response. We are doing this for the related proposal at Stoke House (17/02386/FUL | Erection of 12 study bedroom annex on two floors | Stoke House 7 Stoke Place Oxford OX3 9BX) and the policies that apply for Ruskin Hall are appended to this letter.

It is our view that the two applications should be considered together as a single proposal, a point we make in both of our responses.

Yours sincerely,

Howard Stanbury  
Secretary



## **Headington Neighbourhood Plan**

The planning application 17/02387/FUL (together with 17/02386/FUL) makes no reference to the Headington Neighbourhood Plan Area (HNPA) and in particular to the following policies which we feel should be addressed in considering the proposal:

*CIP1: Development to respect existing local character*

New developments (including additions, alterations, change of use and extensions) will only be permitted where they respond to and enhance the distinctive local character where it is described in the Character Assessments (in this case the Old Headington Conservation Area Character Assessment, which is referenced from the Neighbourhood Plan).

*CIP4: Protecting important assets*

Where the significance of a heritage asset, either designated or non-designated, would be affected by a development proposal, that development proposal will only be permitted where it addresses the conservation and enhancement of the significance, character and any special architectural or historic features of significance the asset may possess.

*GSP2: Provision of Green Space within Developments*

In order to increase and enhance green space within the HNPA:

1. Development proposals which increase public access green space and enhance biodiversity within the HNPA will be approved, including incorporation of biodiversity in and around developments.
2. Significant developments will be subject, where it is appropriate, to a planning condition requiring the submission to and the approval of the Local Planning Authority of Biodiversity Enhancement Plans which include the provision of measures to increase the biodiversity of the site and provide arrangements for their maintenance.
3. The Plan favours the provision of public access green space on site. However, where it can be demonstrated that public access green space cannot be provided on site as part of significant developments, then alternative public access green space must be provided within, or adjacent to, the HNPA. This can be in the form of an extension or enhancement of existing public access green space within, or adjacent to, the HNPA.



*GSP3: Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity*

1. Development proposals that seek to conserve and enhance land which has a significant wildlife or ecological value will be approved.
2. Development proposals which may result in significant harm to sites and/or species of ecological value as defined by Policy CS12 of the Oxford Core Strategy or any future policy in a subsequent development plan document will not be permitted, unless the developer can demonstrate that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the loss, and this can be mitigated against and compensated for elsewhere within the HNPA by providing a replacement habitat on an equivalent or higher ecological value.

*GSP4: Protection of the Setting of the Site*

Development will be permitted where its design responds appropriately to the site and character of the surrounding area.

*TRP3: Travel Plans*

1. Any new development which falls above the threshold set by the City Council Parking Standards, Transport Assessment and Travel Plans SPD will be expected to prepare a travel plan showing how employees and residents may minimize car use.
2. Any development that requires the submission of a Design and Access Statement will be expected to state whether car-free alternatives have been considered and, if parking provision is to be made, why the car-free alternative have been rejected.

*TRP4: Provision for People with Disabilities to use Active Forms of Transport*

All new developments should include active transport provision for people with disabilities, to make journeys easy by active means.