

## Comments on existing plan

Various local plan / core strategy references need updating.

Ingle Close allotment reinstatement: presumably no longer practicable; appears to be repurposed as cemetery.

BRC2 / Headington Business Association: sounds like there isn't appetite to spend the time from business owners?

BRC3: May be rendered impractical by Use Class E permitting transition from public-facing / retail commercial to offices / private commerce.

EDP1: Use class D1 reference is obsolete.

Housing section: consider emphasising affordable housing for everyone, not just key workers?

HGC1: May be redundant in the face of Local Plan 2036 Policy H3: Employer-linked affordable housing

TRP1: May want to make mention of a possible Workplace Parking Levy

TRP3: Reference to Parking Standards, Transport Assessment and Travel Plans SPD is obsolete

TRP5: Local Plan provision for cycle parking is now detailed and specific; could be retired

LTP4 has been replaced by the LTCP.

Speed limits: 20mph limits now widely in place.

Rapid Transit Buses: why is this trying to resist buses down London Road? What route is favoured?

Congestion Charge: overtaken by events.

Employer Parking / reference to charging per space: mention the Workplace Parking Levy instead.

## Possible future directions

**CIP1: Encouraging evolution of local character where appropriate.** I would suggest that rather than ask for blanket preservation of existing character, where the circumstances are right (primarily, close to the district centre), we might explicitly encourage upward growth to make better use of land.

In such cases, material harm to neighbours, such as overshadowing, would remain a cause for refusal, but increased building size *in and of itself* would not.

Examples of benefits:

- Residential: if building upwards allows replacing a dwelling with two or more, this absorbs housing demand and increases the number of people living within walking distance of our shops, schools and employers. If on the other hand we continue to resist such upward growth, more housing demand will be met on the fringe of the city, where people are less likely to visit our businesses and more likely to drive to work or school.
- Commercial: if commercial developments are encouraged to raise the roofline on appropriate sites, we are more likely to get multi-use developments such as the

proposal for the Co-Op site that would have retained the shop, rather than single-use ones like the approved design which is lower-height but loses the shop.

Examples of suitable sites:

- Not in the vicinity of architecturally-remarkable buildings: listed, historical and similar.
- Proximal to public transport routes.
- Proximal to amenities, businesses or major employers.
- Upward growth would not cause unacceptable loss of daylight to neighbours.
- Upward growth would not cause an increase in parking or traffic.

**Encouraging car-free dwellings.** Related to the above, this is an angle to encourage car-free development: if a person wanting to replace a dwelling with 2+ dwellings, or increase the capacity of an HMO, must show that it will not lead to an increase in parking or traffic pressure, this pushes them towards car-free designs. More car-free dwellings would mean more of a user base for our key public transport routes, which helps retain and encourages enhancement of those services for all users.

**Extensions and new buildings to be treated alike.** We should welcome an extension to an existing dwelling (either to produce a new dwelling, or to extend the existing one) using the same standards as for a new build. Presently extensions are obliged to be subservient to the existing dwelling – it must (a) be modest in size compared to the original, and (b) be clearly distinguishable from the original. However I argue this suppresses additional dwellings, or increases of capacity to HMOs, even in situations where a new dwelling with the same design would be acceptable. Therefore I suggest this principle should only be applied where the existing dwelling has particular architectural merit warranting preservation of the existing dwelling as a contribution to the street scene.

**New policy: encouraging green measures.** We might explicitly welcome rooftop solar, even where it faces the street, except where the building's appearance has very special heritage value. Presently within the conservation area this can be in question due to an obligation to minimise affect on visual amenity; I suggest this is only appropriate in particularly distinctive cases, and generally speaking we should normalise the juxtaposition of modern solar systems with older architecture as a price worth paying for green power.