


 Report of: **Planning Services Business Manager**


 **Executive Board**

 Date: **19th March 2007**

 Item No:

 Title of Report : **Oxford 2026; the Oxford Core Strategy Preferred Options document**

Summary and Recommendations

 **Purpose of report:** To approve, for public consultation, the Preferred Options document for Oxford's Core Strategy.

 **Key decision:** No

 **Portfolio Holder:** Councillor John Goddard

 **Deputy Responsibility:** Environment

 **Ward(s) affected:** All

Report Approved by:

Christopher Kaye- Financial and Asset Management
Kate Chirside – Legal and Democratic Services
Sharon Cosgrove – Strategic Director

Policy Framework:

The production of this document fulfils a commitment of the Local Development Scheme. The Core Strategy will help achieve the strategic aims in the City Council's vision, and will also help deliver the key themes and priorities for the City as set out in the Community Strategy.

Recommendation(s):

Executive Board is recommended to:

1. Approve the Preferred Options document for Oxford's Core Strategy for public consultation; and
2. Authorise the Planning Policy Manager to make any necessary minor editorial corrections to the Core Strategy Preferred Options document.

Introduction

1. Members may recall consultation on the earlier 'Issues and Options' stage of the Core Strategy at Area Committees in July 2006. The Core Strategy has now reached the 'Preferred Options' stage, which is the second of the three main stages in its production. The third stage will be submission to the Secretary of State in January 2008. The timetable towards adoption of the Core Strategy is set out later in this report.
2. The Environment Scrutiny Committee considered an interim report on the Core Strategy Preferred Options at its meeting on 12th February 2007. That report sought the Scrutiny Committees' views on how the Core Strategy should deal with the key strategic planning issues facing Oxford. The comments of the Environment Scrutiny Committee are attached to this report at [Appendix 1](#).

Purpose of the Core Strategy

3. The Core Strategy will be a key document within Oxford's Local Development Framework (LDF). It will set out the key elements of the planning framework for the City, including which broad areas are suitable for housing and other strategic development needs. Essentially it will be a replacement for the Oxfordshire Structure Plan, but only relating to the City. It will also replace some of the higher-level strategic policies in the Oxford Local Plan. The 20-year timeframe of this document corresponds with SEERA's emerging South East Plan.
4. The Core Strategy will set the policy context for future Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). Once the Core Strategy is adopted, all subsequent DPDs and SPDs must be in conformity with the Core Strategy.
5. An important aspect of the new planning system is the change to 'spatial' policies. This means that the Core Strategy and future planning documents are no longer restricted to land-use considerations, and need to take account of the plans and strategies of other agencies. Spatial planning policies can be delivered in a variety of ways and are not solely reliant on being implemented through development control decisions.

Policy Context

6. The Core Strategy has to be consistent with national planning policy and be in general conformity with the policies of the South East Plan. However, one of the challenges of spatial planning is to ensure that policies are locally distinctive and do not simply repeat national and regional guidance. The Core Strategy should also identify the main priorities that deliver the spatial aspects of the Community Strategy.

Research and evidence base

7. The Core Strategy Preferred Options document has been informed by a wide range of published research and evidence, including the following studies in particular; the Housing Requirements Study (2004); the Housing Viability Study (2004); the draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2007), which will be published for consultation alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options; the draft county-wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007); the Employment Land Study (2006); the Retail Needs Study (2004); and the Green Space Study (2005).
8. Work is currently underway on updating the Retail Needs Study and on two further pieces of research: the Role of Education and Health Sectors in Oxford's Economy; and the Hotel and Short-Stay Accommodation Study. In addition, it is intended to shortly commission a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of the whole of Oxford. These studies will be completed in time to inform production of the submission version of the Core Strategy, as well as future Development Plan Documents, such as the Site Allocations DPD.

Previous consultation

9. One of the main principles of the new planning system is that local communities and stakeholders should be involved from the outset in the preparation of planning policy documents. In line with this principle, the City Council conducted an extensive public consultation exercise last summer to coincide with the publication of Oxford 2026; the Core Strategy Issues and Options paper. The purpose of this first stage of public consultation was to seek views on how Oxford should plan for, and manage, change and development over the next 20 years.
10. The consultation aimed to involve the whole community by sending a questionnaire to each household in Oxford. In addition, specific letters were sent to a wide range of organisations, including statutory bodies, interest groups, and developers. Twelve staffed exhibitions were held in locations across Oxford.
11. A brief summary of the main findings of the consultation exercise is contained in [Appendix 2](#). A much fuller report is available to view on the City Council's website at www.oxford.gov.uk/corestrategy.
12. Officers also held a series of meetings with key partners and stakeholders during 2006 in order to understand fully the needs and aspirations of those organisations and to inform preparation of the Preferred Options document.

The Preferred Options document

13. Preferred Options is a key stage in the new development planning system, and perhaps the stage that differs most from the previous system of Structure and Local Plans. The purpose of the Preferred Options stage for a Core Strategy is to set out and consult upon the preferred spatial strategy, without becoming unduly preoccupied with detailed policy wording.
14. The Preferred Options document is attached at [Appendix 3](#). It can be divided into three main sections. The first section is the introduction and spatial strategy. This starts with a general introduction to the document, and provides some background information about Oxford (the spatial portrait). It then sets out the main issues and challenges facing the City, which leads onto the spatial vision and objectives. The proposed spatial strategy includes a set of key principles, which provide the framework for the options that follow later in the document.
15. The second main section of the document is grouped into themes, such as supporting prosperity and creating safe, active and healthy communities. Within each theme are topic-based options, which cover a range of issues e.g. housing numbers; affordable housing; employment provision; the retail hierarchy; student accommodation; flooding and transport.
16. Where a number of options have been identified, the pros and cons of each of the alternative options are set out alongside the City Council's preferred option. Where only one option seems appropriate, this has been put forward as a preferred approach. It will still be possible for consultees to object to a preferred approach, or to suggest amendments to the approach suggested.
17. The third main section of the document, entitled strategic locations for development, focuses on particular areas that are of strategic importance to the future growth and development of Oxford. It deals with the difficult choices that need to be made about future development within the City, including options relating to the identification of strategic greenfield sites to accommodate housing and employment growth.
18. The document ends with a short section on implementation and monitoring, which will be expanded at submission stage, and the key diagram.

Tests of Soundness

19. A key feature of the new development planning system is the requirement for DPDs to pass nine 'tests of soundness', which are set out in PPS12: Local Development Frameworks and attached to this report at [Appendix 4](#). The new system is still bedding down, and a

number of local planning authorities have run into difficulties in the preparation of their Core Strategies. Some Core Strategies have been rejected as unsound and others have had to be withdrawn before reaching Examination. Even those Core Strategies that have so far passed the tests of soundness have not been held up as examples of best practice.

20. The attached Preferred Options document has a similar format to the West End Area Action Plan, which received positive feedback at the Preferred Options stage. Nevertheless, in the absence of any definitive guide to best practice on Core Strategies, officers will be seeking to obtain informal views from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) and the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) prior to the meeting. If any significant issues are raised by either of those bodies, they will be reported orally to Members.

Sustainability Appraisal

21. The City Council has undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which includes a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This considers the social, economic and environmental effects of the document, and ensures that, as far as possible, it accords with the principles of 'sustainable development'. Each of the preferred options has been developed, refined and assessed against sustainability criteria. The various alternative options have also been assessed against the same criteria.
22. The Sustainability Appraisal report (SA/SEA) will be published for consultation alongside the Preferred Options document. Since the SA/SEA report is a lengthy technical document, a short Non-Technical Summary has been prepared and is attached to this report at [Appendix 5](#). A full copy of the SA/SEA report is available for Members to view in each of the Party rooms.

Relevant Council Resolutions of 20th November 2006

23. At the Council meeting on 20th November, two resolutions were passed which are of relevance to the Core Strategy. The first concerned social housing provision, as follows:

"This Council notes that the requirement for new housing developments is that social housing should make up 50% on sites with more than 10 dwellings. Implementation of policy has been subject to flexible interpretation both in terms of the location and number of resultant social housing units built. There is a particular concern that developers can effectively circumvent the 50% rule by proposing student accommodation for the majority of a windfall site, with the 50% rule then only applying to the remaining minority of the site.

This Council resolves to invite the Executive to request the relevant officers to review policy (more specifically but not restricted to the following Local Plan policies:-

- *HS.4 – General Requirement to provide Affordable Housing*
- *HS.5 – Proportion and Mix of Affordable Housing to be provided*
- *HS.6 – On-Site Provision of Affordable Housing*
- *HS.7 – Affordable Housing and Commercial Development),*

with the intention of tightening its formulation so as to ensure that housing development in the City reflects the need for a substantial increase in social housing units.”

24. Officers have reviewed the affordable housing policies in the Local Plan, and the Core Strategy Preferred Options document sets out four different options in relation to affordable housing from residential development, together with a preferred approach regarding affordable housing from commercial development. The Core Strategy also aims to increase the supply of social housing units by increasing the overall housing growth target above the current Local Plan/Structure Plan level.
25. However, in relation to the specific issue of student accommodation, it would not be reasonable to require affordable housing from such developments. Student accommodation is not self-contained housing, and is not in the same Planning Use Class as residential dwellings. The Core Strategy includes a preferred option that seeks to continue to progressively reduce the number of students at both universities living outside of university-provided accommodation, so as to release more housing in the City for other types of residential use. This will be very challenging for the universities to achieve, and requires further increases in purpose-built student accommodation. To require a proportion of affordable housing from student accommodation would make it highly unlikely that new student accommodation would come forward in the quantity required to meet the proposed targets.
26. The second resolution concerned climate change, as follows:

“This Council has:-

- *On many occasions stated its commitment to tackling climate change.*
- *Introduced progressive planning policies, such as the Natural Resources Impact Assessment (NRIA), to try and ensure that new buildings use less energy and are responsible for fewer carbon dioxide emissions.*

However, this Council notes that even if new buildings meet the stringent standards set out in the NRIA they will still draw on off-site energy supplies that are unlikely to be from renewable sources.

The Council therefore asks the Executive to ask officers to develop a comprehensive planning policy response to climate change, starting

with the Core Strategy Preferred Options Development Plan document, including an additional climate change obligation to secure developer contributions towards off-site measures which might mitigate climate change.”

27. The Core Strategy Preferred Options document highlights climate change as a major issue, and constitutes the beginning of a comprehensive planning policy response to climate change as requested in this resolution. Climate change features prominently in the proposed Spatial Vision and Objectives for the Core Strategy, together with the Spatial Strategy. The Core Strategy Preferred Options also develops relevant Local Plan policies, such as those relating to flooding and energy and natural resources.
28. Once the strategic planning framework set by the Core Strategy has been confirmed, we will be able to further review how to take forward our policy work on climate change. However, it is not currently within the scope of relevant guidance and legislation to collect developer contributions towards off-site climate change mitigation measures other than in bespoke circumstances, e.g. where a particular development might benefit from an area-wide Combined Heat and Power scheme. The type of obligation proposed in the resolution would not be appropriate as a general policy because there is a need to demonstrate that any mitigation measures for which contributions are sought are directly relevant to the development in question.

Financial and Staffing Implications

29. The production of the Core Strategy is a commitment in the Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS sets out key milestones, against which the City Council's performance will be monitored and which may affect future level of Planning Delivery Grant. The costs of consultation and further work on the Core Strategy will be met from existing budgets.
30. The City Council is a significant landowner and some options within the Core Strategy may affect land within the Council's ownership. However, it is not appropriate to consider the potential financial implications for the Council in assessing the planning merits of particular land-use and development options.

Core Strategy timetable

31. Following consideration by Executive Board, the Preferred Options will be subject to a 6-week public consultation period from 30th March to 11th May 2007. During that time, all Members will have a chance to consider the document, as it will be reported to the April cycle of Area Committees. There will also be three area-based workshops/planning events, which will be spread geographically by grouping the six Area Committees into pairs.

32. Comments and responses collected from public consultation will help inform the submission Core Strategy document. This will be reported to Executive Board and Council, and submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2008. An Examination by an independent Inspector is currently programmed for summer 2008, with adoption anticipated to be in March 2009.

Name and contact details of author:

Adrian Roche, 252165, aroche@oxford.gov.uk

Background papers:

None for this covering report but the Core Strategy Preferred Options document contains references to other strategies and sources of information.

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1	Environment Scrutiny Committee comments
Appendix 2	Summary of Issues & Options consultation
Appendix 3	Core Strategy Preferred Options document
Appendix 4	Tests of Soundness from PPS12
Appendix 5	Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary

Appendix 1 – Environment Scrutiny Committee comments
(extract from draft minutes of meeting on 12th February 2007)

The Planning Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended).

Adrian Roche and Mark Jaggard introduced the report and answered Members questions. During the discussion a number of points were raised as follows:

In relation to Housing, the Committee agreed that the preferred housing option would be that which resulted in the highest number of housing units being achieved, including family accommodation and affordable dwellings. However, the declining availability of suitable land was recognised with many brownfield sites now accounted for. Development in future years may have to take place on greenfield land. That said, the Committee supported the option of building more than 550 units a year to meet housing need. They also supported a limitation on flat conversions.

In relation to Climate Change, the Committee again confirmed its commitment to a 3% annual reduction of carbon emissions and felt that the document should reflect the council's commitment to this. In addition, other businesses, organisations and individuals in Oxford should achieve this ambition. The document should reflect this aim.

The Committee acknowledged the pressures for further retail development in the city centre, but endorsed the idea of greater emphasis being placed on local retail centres, such as the development of a mixed-use district centre in Blackbird Leys.

The Committee didn't come to a consensus on whether there should be a moratorium on development within flood zone 3a. Members suggested that reference was made to the Environment Agency flood map so that members of the public and area committees would be aware of the size of the affected area. Members did accept that tough decisions on the use of protected land may have to be taken to realise Oxford's development plans.

Resolved to ask the Head of Planning to refer the Committee's comments to the Executive Board to consider when it discusses the Core Strategy Preferred Options report.

Appendix 2 – Summary of Issues and Options Consultation

Consultation response

1. At the close of the consultation, 2,205 questionnaires had been received (2,147 leaflets and 58 stakeholders questionnaires). In addition, a further 40 letters were received from stakeholders. Age groupings of respondents were fairly even apart from the under 25 group, which accounted for only 4% of responses. More women than men responded in each age group. Responses were relatively evenly distributed between the OX2, OX3 and OX4 postcodes, with a minor advantage from OX4. The City centre area (OX1) only accounted for 10% of the responses, which is to be expected given that this postcode covers a smaller area than the other three.
2. Whilst the consultation proved to be generally very successful, there was clearly an under-representation of younger people in the survey and the results therefore need to be read with that in mind. In addition, despite contacting representatives of many community and hard to reach groups, and selecting venues for the exhibitions ranging from the staff canteen at BMW to the Asian Cultural Centre in East Oxford, it is acknowledged that there was limited meaningful engagement with hard to reach groups.

Results of the public questionnaire

3. These are the main findings of the questionnaires sent to residents and completed at exhibitions. Results have been combined in order to give a general impression of the issues raised.

Housing

4. Providing more housing was the least popular choice when asked how to improve quality of life in Oxford, although a significant minority considered it the most important factor. In terms of housing requirements, family housing was considered to be the greatest need with purpose built flats and housing for the elderly also enjoying good support. Conversions, student accommodation and live/work units were thought of as the least important dwelling types for the City. Respondents felt that new developments should be built to higher densities and concentrated on brownfield land, whilst the options of building on Safeguarded Land and reviewing the Green Belt also enjoyed some support. Perhaps unsurprisingly, residents strongly opposed building on greenfield land such as playing fields within the City.

Employment

5. Creating more jobs was also an unpopular choice in terms of improving quality of life. In terms of employment uses, the top priorities given by

the respondents were high-tech research and development, and the education and health care/hospital sectors. Tourism had some support but is not a priority, while industrial and office development were considered the least suitable options.

Transport

6. There is a large consensus to reduce traffic congestion in order to improve quality of life; transport was also the top priority that the public would like to see change by 2026. Improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists was considered a priority, whilst providing more car parking facilities was not. The idea of congestion charging was clearly disliked. Improving roads and junctions for all traffic and developing a rapid mass transit system had dispersed values, gaining both positive and negative support.

Leisure and Retail

7. The highest priority for improving the attractiveness of the City centre to shoppers was the promotion of greater choice and more specialist shops while one of the less popular options was simply for more shops. Improving the appearance of the shopping environment was also considered relevant but the provision of more car parking attracted little support. In terms of leisure facilities, an indoor arena gained the greatest support, whilst new and improved parks and indoor sports facilities were also considered necessary. Cultural attractions were deemed to be the lowest priority.

Results of the stakeholder questionnaire

8. The majority of stakeholders agreed with the Core Strategy's spatial issues, suggested list of visions and objectives, but added other issues/objectives etc to be considered alongside them. They also concurred very closely with the results of the public questionnaire regarding types of housing, transport, employment, leisure, shopping and the location of future development. The only major difference between the two questionnaires was the results of the improving quality of life issue, where many stakeholders believed that providing more housing would be of positive benefit.
9. Both sets of respondents were in agreement about the kind of city they would like to see and what is most important to preserve. They would like Oxford to be perceived as an environmentally aware, historic and cultural city, with relatively little support for the car-free and high-tech city options. Unsurprisingly, there was consensus that it is most important to preserve Oxford's character, history and culture, together with its natural and built environment. Likewise, there was agreement across both questionnaires that transport is the most important thing to change in Oxford over the next 20 years.

Results of the workshops

10. Whilst the stakeholders workshop was reasonably well attended, the public workshop was poorly attended. This may have been due to the hot weather, insufficient advance publicity, or the fact that at this early stage the Core Strategy had not generated any significant local press coverage.
11. Both workshops sparked interesting debate across a range of topics, including housing, economic growth, transport, the natural and built environment and wider quality of life issues. Although there was some agreement about the key issues facing Oxford, no consensus emerged in terms of the strategic planning framework; i.e. some people supported a policy of managed growth, whereby further expansion takes place within and adjoining the City, whereas others favoured a policy of containment with growth being directed towards the County Towns.

Appendix 4 – Tests of Soundness from PPS12

1. The DPD (Development Plan Document) has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme
2. It has been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), or with the minimum requirements set out in the Regulations where no SCI exists
3. The plan and its policies have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal
4. It is a spatial plan which is consistent with national planning policy and in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy for the region or, in London, the spatial development strategy and it has properly had regard to any other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or to adjoining areas
5. It has had regard to the authority's community strategy
6. The strategies/policies/allocations in the plan are coherent and consistent within and between development plan documents prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross-boundary issues are relevant
7. The strategies/policies/allocations represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base
8. There are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
9. It is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances

Note: In recent Core Strategy Examinations, Test 4 has been sub-divided as follows:

- 4a. It is a spatial plan
- 4b. It is consistent with national planning policy
- 4c. It is in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy

Appendix 5 – Non-Technical Summary for the Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal

Introduction

The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, economic and environmental considerations in the preparation of planning policy documents. The preparation of the SA of the Oxford Core Strategy involved two key stages:

- The production of a Scoping Report setting out what the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal would be, which was published in September 2005.
- The production of the Sustainability Appraisal Report, which is being published with this Non-Technical Summary to accompany the Core Strategy Preferred Options document.

The Scoping Report identified the following key sustainability issues in Oxford:

- Significant residential areas are at risk of flooding;
- Lack of affordable housing;
- Need to make adequate provision for health care and reduce inequalities in health;
- Pockets of poverty, social exclusion and deprivation;
- Poor air quality measured in central Oxford;
- High levels of traffic flow and congestion across Oxford;
- Reliance on energy generated from fossil fuels with low levels coming from renewable energy;
- Protecting/ enhancing open spaces and areas of conservation interest in the face of strong development pressures.

These key sustainability issues, through a careful assessment of issues raised by the public, stakeholders and technical advice, were used to inform the selection and refinement of the Core Strategy Preferred Options.

Each of the preferred options and alternative options has been assessed against twenty-five sustainability objectives. The effects were assessed with reference to the available baseline information. The preferred options are generally representative of the options with the most positive and least negative impacts. Measures aimed at mitigating negative impacts and strengthening positive impacts were also identified.

This Non-Technical Summary identifies the key findings of the appraisal process. It does not discuss options where there were no significant sustainability issues.

Summary of Key Findings

Housing Numbers:

Given the high level of need for affordable housing the preferred option (550 dwellings a year) was considered most suitable, as it would result in the highest provision of units that would be possible without being likely to have significant adverse impacts on the built environment and countryside.

Timing of Housing Delivery:

The findings of the SA led to a reassessment of the weighting of the options. The original preferred option was to allow housing to be delivered on identified sites as soon as they become available, but this was found to have potential longer-term adverse effects in terms of service provision and infrastructure. The SA indicated that there were significant but differing benefits from both options, and they are now given equal status.

Affordable Housing:

The SA found there to be little variation between the options, other than the fact that the option for 50% affordable housing based on floorspace rather than units may be slightly more likely to help deliver sustainable communities.

Economy:

The preferred approach for building on Oxford's economic strengths was altered to take account of the SA and now incorporates a sentence on the provision of supporting infrastructure.

The preferred option of managed growth was found to be more beneficial against economic objectives than minimal growth, but less likely to have adverse environmental impacts than the higher growth options. The higher growth options are not currently deliverable as they involve land outside the City, and would need to be matched by additional housing to be sustainable.

Retail:

The three retail options were all assessed as being sustainable options. The preferred option of creating a new district centre at Blackbird Leys was considered to have significant sustainability benefits in terms of local job provision and improving accessibility to retail services for local residents.

Health and the Hospitals:

Each of the three options has significant sustainability benefits and drawbacks. As such, no preferred option was selected.

Education:

There was no clear difference in sustainability terms between the two options for the University of Oxford. As such, no preferred option was selected.

Flooding:

The SA found that the preferred option for flooding was very sustainable. The SA also highlights sustainable drainage as an important issue.

Biodiversity:

The SA highlighted that there is the potential for the level of development to have a significant impact on biodiversity unless strong emphasis is given to conserving existing features of interest and creating new areas as part of new developments.

Transport, Accessibility and Traffic Generation:

The SA highlighted potential conflicts between the impact of higher levels of housing in Oxford on the City's road network, and the fact that locating more housing in Oxford would be likely to reduce in-commuting. Likewise, the concentration of services in a particular area, such as the hospitals in Headington, is likely to reduce overall mileage and emissions but there could be significant localised transport impacts.

The SA found the preferred option on short-term transport infrastructure to be sustainable, but identified the need for more innovative longer-term improvements to accommodate additional development in the City. This helped to develop the preferred approach on long-term transport infrastructure, which was found to have a number of potential positive impacts.

Strategic Locations for Development:

The SA found the preferred approaches relating to the City centre and District centres to be sustainable as they encourage development in sustainable locations. The preferred approach relating to regeneration areas was found to be sustainable as it would meet social inclusion objectives.

Green Belt

The SA helped to refine the preferred approach. It found that a review of the inner boundary of the Oxford Green Belt would be unlikely to provide much land for development because nearly all of this land has value for biodiversity or recreational reasons, and/or helps to preserve the landscape setting and character of Oxford, and/or is in the flood plain. The preferred approach is now for the North Oxford Gateway AAP and the Site Allocations DPD to consider the potential for any small-scale review of the Green Belt.

Peartree/ Northern Gateway Safeguarded Land

The land at Peartree was not considered to be a sustainable location for residential development due to noise and air pollution from the surrounding roads. The SA considered that the site performed strongly against the economic objectives, but unless significant transport mitigation measures were implemented, would be unlikely to be a completely sustainable location.

Summertown Safeguarded Land

The SA considered that this land would be a sustainable location for residential development, although care would be needed to avoid any adverse impacts on the adjacent Cherwell Valley green wedge.

Barton Safeguarded Land

The SA found that residential development would be positive in relation to meeting Oxford's housing needs. Options relating to hospital/ university and employment uses would be likely to have positive impacts on Oxford's economic prosperity. There are likely significant effects on road congestion and pollution associated with employment and commercial/ retail development. This is due to the likelihood that they would generate more car journeys. There are less significant traffic generation impacts associated with medical research linked to the Headington hospital sites.

Southfield Golf Course

Although a very sustainable location in terms of location (close to District centres and bus routes to the City centre), the SA found that there was likely to be significant adverse impacts on biodiversity including potential impacts on the Lye Valley SSSI. The golf course and the surrounding area are considered to have a high landscape quality. There could be positive impacts in terms of increased public access, but the adverse impacts on biodiversity arising from any large-scale development would be difficult to mitigate.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Monday 19 March 2007

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillors Goddard (Chair), Armitage, Bance, Fooks, Malik, Murray, Sellwood, Tall and van Zyl.

OFFICERS PRESENT FOR THE WHOLE OF THE MEETING: Sharon Cosgrove, Mark Luntley and Michael Lawrence (Strategic Directors), Sue Shutter (Human Resources Business Manager), Lindsay Cane and Brenda Lammin (Legal and Democratic Services Business Unit) and Louisa Dean (Media and Communications).

OFFICERS PRESENT FOR PART OF THE MEETING: Andrew Davies, Pat Jones, Ben Smith, Claire Thomas, Alan Brown and Penny Randall (Strategy and Review Business Unit), Paul Robinson (Environmental Health Business Unit), Mark Jaggard and Adrian Roche (Planning Services Business Unit), Graham Stratford, Nerys Parry, Dave Scholes, Marianne Upton and Steve Northey (Community Housing Business Unit), Val Johnson, Craig Buckby and Nicola Harrison (Neighbourhood Renewal Business Unit), John Kulasek and Martin Lyons (Financial and Asset Management Business Unit).

273. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Rundle (Vice-Chair), Malik, Murray and Tall.

274. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following personal interests were declared in respect of the item on Grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations 2007/08 (minute 286): -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Reason for declaration</u>
Bance	Member of Oxford Credit Union and Surestart
Fooks	Member of Oxford Credit Union

Mark Luntley, Strategic Director, Finance and Corporate Services, declared a financial interest in the Oxford Credit Union and left the room during discussion of the item on Grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations 2007/08 (minute 286).

275. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Questions asked in accordance with Procedure Rule 13(iii), together with the responses given, are summarised below: -

Question Dr John Leung - Oxfordshire Chinese Community and Advice Centre - on Grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations 2007/08 (minute 286)

Except for OCCAC, and bowls clubs that have transitional arrangements in place, all other organisations occupying Council premises will have a full grant to meet their rental charges, including our advice work colleagues the Oxford Community Work Agency (Barton) and Agnes Smith Advice Centre.

1. Why has OCCAC been treated so differently and so unfairly than other organisations occupying Council premises?
2. Has there been any consideration of
 - (a) the nature of our work - helping non-English speaking Chinese in Oxford to gain access to services and benefits?
 - (b) and ability to pay such a substantial rent increase without giving us sufficient grant?
3. Can you not enforce market rent on our building, which we have been using for 15 years, in order to meet your corporate income target, or can you increase our grant?

Response from Councillor van Zyl (Safer City Portfolio Holder)

The position on the OCCAC rent is complicated. In 2005 the OCCAC approached Estates about taking on additional space at 44B Princess Street, previously occupied by the Immigration and Nationality Project. Another group also applied, the Befriending Network. Following negotiations with Estates it was agreed that OCCAC would pay an additional £5,000 for the new space. Estates understood that OCCAC could find this sum from their own resources.

Under the new lease the rent for the whole building – existing and new is £18,000. If you reduce this by the £5,000 that they have agreed to pay from within their own resources and then deduct the £4,500 for existing premises this leaves a gap of £8,500. In normal circumstances rent for community facilities can be paid via a paper transaction between the Grants Budget and Estates Budgets. This does not apply if the property is HRA or if there is an income target for that property. For example if a previous tenant had paid rent money to Estates as this budget is taken into account in the over all budget setting of the Council. This is why OCCAC has been treated differently.

In relation to the specific questions:

Officers have considered the nature of the work as set out in application. The service is the same as it was last year – Drop in advice is restricted to Mondays only between 10.00 am and 4.00 pm. Appointments are offered throughout the week.

Monitoring information indicates that in relation to advice about 60% of their clients come from the City and 40% outside. It seems unfair for the City Council

to pay all of the rent to support these activities when more than 40% of the clients are from outside the City and the centre is used to support day care for the County council.

It was understood by the Estates Officers that OCCAC could fund the £5,000 for the new premises out of their own resources. This now appears to be in doubt. Estates advise that it is policy to set a market rent for community and voluntary groups in City Council properties and it is up to the organisation to request grant contribution. This is to ensure transparency. The problem is that estates set the rent but the Grants budget does not get any increase to compensate.

Discussions about increasing the grant to OCCAC are ongoing. No decision can be made today to increase the grant. However, I can give an assurance that we will do all we can to bridge at least some of the funding shortfall and that should be confirmed in the next week or two. The means of achieving this is likely to be by taking back some of the money provisionally identified as a budget saving, but that will be dependent upon the outcome of the discussion on the report later in the agenda.

Question from Carol Richards - Dovecote Voluntary Parent Committee - on Grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations 2007/08 (minute 286)

1. The Oxford City Children & Young People's Plan that was adopted by the Executive Board in December, proposed the following area (1 of 4) should be the priorities that the City Council focuses upon over the following year: to continue to support affordable holiday play activities, sports, leisure and cultural activities, in line with the City Council Social Inclusion, Healthy Communities and Crime Reduction strategies. Why did the Board favour allocating large grants, £72,100 Modern Art and £51,690 Oxford Play House, which are non community or voluntary groups in the case of the Play House a profit making organisation and award a voluntary community group addressing more priorities of the Children & Young People's Plan ZERO, not only this year but for the past 7 years?
2. What does the Dovecote Voluntary Parent Committee need to do to get the Executive Board to support the continuation of essential and vital, good quality, low cost facilities they offer to parents and children aged 0 to 12 yrs old – (not 0-5 as stated in your summary of the Dovecote bid) in a nationally recognised area of disadvantage?

Response from Councillor van Zyl (Safer City Portfolio Holder)

The grants budget covers a wide variety of themes, including Active and Healthy Communities. This theme covered arts, sports, older people, twinning and play. Under this theme the City Council was able to fund play provision but could not support the cost of child care provision, which was a County Council function.

The priorities agreed within the City Children and Young People's Plan were:

- Ensuring that the City Council meets the guidelines of the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children's Board, including its policy and procedures, recruitment, awareness raising and staff training programme.
- To work with the County Council and other District Councils to develop a standard consultation process for children and young people.
- To continue to support affordable holiday play activities, sports, leisure and cultural activities, in line with the City Council Social Inclusion, Healthy Communities and Crime Reduction strategies.

In line with this the City Council has made an investment of an additional £120,000 in holiday play schemes. The Dovecote has been supported through grants from the City Council for many years for activities that the County Council and or local schools have the statutory duty and budgets for. Given the City Council priorities and that it is in a recognised area of disadvantage the Dovecote holiday play scheme activities are being supported again in 2007/08.

276. ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION – VARIOUS

The Environment Scrutiny Committee submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). The Board also considered the comments of Councillor Phelps (Chair of the Environment Scrutiny Committee).

Resolved that in respect of various recommendations from the Environment Scrutiny Committee on 12 February 2007: -

- (1) further to recommendation 1 on the draft supplementary planning documents on planning obligations not applying to small piecemeal developments, it was noted that it was not possible for a supplementary planning document to alter a threshold set in the main planning document, and that area committees had the opportunity to influence how Section 106 monies were spent in their areas;
- (2) further to recommendation 2 on waste reduction and recycling targets, it was noted that it would not be possible to set more challenging targets for the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership due to resource implications for other authorities, but there was scope to set tougher waste reduction and recycling targets for Oxford City Council subject to provision of resources to deliver the higher performance, and the Chair of the Environment Scrutiny Committee and the Director, Physical Environment, would discuss that outside of the Executive Board meeting (a report on provisional target setting for all BVPIs was due to come to the April meeting of the Executive Board);
- (3) further to recommendation 3 on references to tackling climate change and promoting environment resource management in the Oxford Plan, it was noted that the Oxford Plan 2007/10 had been agreed by Council and could not be changed at this stage, however the wording in the current Oxford

Plan did not preclude action being taken to make Council buildings and facilities less vulnerable to the effects of climate change and the appointment of an Energy Manager (agreed in the 2007/08 Budget) would enable more of that type of work to be undertaken.

277. ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION – THAMES TOWPATH

The Community Scrutiny Committee submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). The Board also considered the comments of Councillor Phelps (Chair of the Environment Scrutiny Committee).

Resolved that further to a recommendation of the Environment Scrutiny Committee on the Thames Towpath it be noted that joint funding and joint working with the County Council had now been agreed for both emergency repairs and a longer term repair programme.

278. COMMUNITY SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION – ENFORCEMENT

The Environment Scrutiny Committee submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). The Board also considered the comments of Councillor Sinclair (Chair of the Community Scrutiny Committee).

Resolved that further to a recommendation of the Community Scrutiny Committee on the Council's Enforcement Protocol it be noted that: -

- (1) a further seminar was to be held in April to report on the results of the consultation on the draft Enforcement Protocol and to bring members up to date with the Council's enforcement policies and practices;
- (2) enforcement action was a last resort and a reduction in the amount of litter on the streets was a better indicator of success than the number of fixed penalty notices issued;
- (3) the enforcement situation was fluid and would continue to be reviewed regularly in light of changing circumstances;
- (4) the Strategic Director, Housing, Health and Community, had clarified that comments made at the Community Scrutiny Committee that Street Wardens were reluctant to issue fixed penalty notices because conflicting advice had been received were based on a misunderstanding, and he had been advised that the Neighbourhood Renewal Business Unit was satisfied with advice being given by Legal Services.

279. AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY REVIEW – OFFICER RESPONSE

The Community Housing Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). The Board also considered the comments of

Councillor Scanlan (Chair of the Affordable Housing Scrutiny Review Group).

Resolved that the actions proposed by the officers, as set out in the report, be endorsed as the Board's response to the Affordable Housing Scrutiny Review.

280. OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH CONTRACT – MAJOR PROJECT APPROVAL

The Human Resources Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) the Human Resources Business Manager be authorised to award the Occupational Health Service contract or contracts to the supplier or suppliers offering the most economically advantageous terms to the Council after all the tenders received had been fully considered;
- (2) Major Project Approval be granted for the contract package referred to in resolution (1) above.

281. CORE STRATEGY – PREFERRED OPTIONS DOCUMENT

The Planning Services Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). The Board also considered supplementary information concerning amendments to the Core Strategy suggested as a result of comments received from the Government Office South East (GOSE).

Resolved that: -

- (1) the Preferred Options document for Oxford's Core Strategy (Appendix 3 to the report) be approved for public consultation, subject to the amendments referred to at the meeting;
- (2) the Planning Policy Manager, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to make any necessary amendments to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document arising from GOSE's comments (a summary of the main amendments is attached as Annex 1 to the minutes);
- (3) the Planning Policy Manager be authorised to make any necessary minor editorial corrections to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document.

282. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE SUPPLY AND LAYING OF PLAYGROUND SURFACES TO SUPPORT THE REFURBISHMENT OF OXFORD'S PLAYGROUNDS

The Facilities Management Business Manager submitted a report (previously

circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) Major Project Approval be granted for a project under which one supplier is appointed, as and when required, to replace the playground surfaces in Oxford for which Oxford City Council had responsibility;
- (2) the contract be awarded to Playtop Ltd to carry out the work referred to in resolution (1) above, noting that: -
 - a. the supplier had been selected as a result of the restricted tender process in accordance with the Council's Constitution and Contract Procedure Rules;
 - b. the contract would be for two years, starting on 1 April 2007, with an option to extend for up to one further year.

283. COUNCIL MOTION – GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The Environmental Health Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that a focused energy management plan be developed by the new Energy Manager and the Climate Change Action Team to ensure the 3% year-on-year greenhouse gas reduction target is met.

284. CHANGES TO THE DAYTIME PARKING PERIOD AND PARKING TARIFFS IN THE CITY CENTRE CAR PARKS

The Transport and Parking Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) approval be given to changing the start time of the evening charge at the Westgate, Worcester Street, Gloucester Green Underground, Abbey Place and Oxpens car parks from 6.30 pm to 8.00 pm;
- (2) approval be given to the change in tariffs, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
- (3) Oxfordshire County Council be formally consulted on the proposals;
- (4) it be noted that the Head of Legal and Democratic had delegated powers to promote off street parking place orders and that the Transport and Parking Business Manager had delegated powers to negotiate and determine minor points of objection in relation to advertised car park proposals, and that those delegated powers would be used for the

proposals in the report.

285. PARK AND RIDE PARKING TARIFF INCREASES

The Transport and Parking Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) approval be given to the increase in the parking tariff at the Peartree, Seacourt and Redbridge park and ride sites, from £0.60 to £1.00 with no discounts, as set out in the report;
- (2) Oxfordshire County Council be formally consulted on the proposals;
- (3) Officers be asked to look into ways of making it easier and more convenient for people to get hold of season tickets.

286. HORSPATH RESOURCE CENTRE – FINANCIAL REPORT

The Neighbourhood Renewal Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that support be continued for the development of service through the Shotover Day Care Centre and that any monies owed be recovered by way of “claw back” from the Horspath Road Centre.

287. GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY BODIES

The Neighbourhood Renewal Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). The Board also considered supplementary information submitted concerning recommendations of Area Committees, the Community Scrutiny Committee and the Grants Disputes Panel, and officer recommendations for grants in light of that information.

Resolved that: -

- (1) 50% of the inflationary increase of £38,809 be offered up as a budget saving for 2007/08, and the other 50% be added to the contingency fund for emergency grants in 2007/08;
- (2) the comments of the Community Scrutiny Committee, Area Committees and Disputes Panel, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be noted;
- (3) the following grants be made for 2007/08 (noting that further discussions would be taking place with the Oxfordshire Chinese Community and Advice Centre with a view to increasing their grant): -

PROJECT	£
AFRICAN & AFRICAN CARIBBEAN KULTURAL HERITAGE INITIATIVE	10,000
AGE CONCERN OXFORDSHIRE	7,500
AGNES SMITH ADVICE CENTRE	57,044
ARCHWAY	4,000
ARTWEEKS	4,120
ASYLUM WELCOME	3,750
BARTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION	500
BBL 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS	4,000
BLACKBIRD LEYS ADVENTURE PLAYGROUND	18,750
BRITISH SUB AQUA CLUB	11,900
CHENEY 50+	300
CHERWELL HOUSING - SIMON HOUSE	11,825
CONNECTION FLOATING SUPPORT	20,468
CRANSTOUN DRUG SERVICES	5,000
CUTTESLOWE SENIORS	750
DONNINGTON DOORSTEP	21,600
EAST OXFORD ACTION	15,500
ELDER STUBBS GARDEN GROUP	2,570
ELMORE	41,200
ENGLISH CHURCHES HOUSING GROUP	25,000
ETHNIC MINORITY BUSINESS SERVICE	5,000
FOCUS	8,017
FUSION	46,642
GATEHOUSE	9,270
HEADINGTON ACTION	2,500
HINKSEY SCULLING SCHOOL	1,020
ITHACA	5,281
JACQUELINE DU PRE MUSIC BUILDING	1,000
KEEN	4,000
LAKE STREET PLAY GRP	14,900
LIFE HOUSING	8,837
LORD MAYORS DEPOSIT GUARANTEE SCHEME	95,000
MODERN ART OXFORD	72,100
NIGHT SHELTER	130,177
OXFORD AFRICAN REFUGEES & FAMILIES DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY	5,000
OXFORD ASSOCIATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCHES	17,500
OXFORD CAB BENEFITS IN PRACTICE	20,000
OXFORD CHAMBER MUSIC FESTIVAL	2,475
OXFORD CITIZEN'S ADVICE BUREAU	170,000
OXFORD COMMUNITY WORK AGENCY	81,060
OXFORD CONTEMPORARY MUSIC	6,952
OXFORD CREDIT UNION	20,000

OXFORD FEDERATION OF COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS	20,000
OXFORD FILM VIDEO MAKERS	38,303
OXFORD FOLK FESTIVAL	4,000
OXFORD FRIEND	3,000
OXFORD GRENOBLE ASSOCIATION	1,200
OXFORD INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S FESTIVAL	1,875
OXFORD LEIDEN LINK	1,000
OXFORD PLAYHOUSE	51,690
OXFORD SEXUAL ABUSE & RAPE CRISIS CENTRE	6,000
OXFORD URBAN WILDLIFE GROUP	3,373
OXFORD WHEELS	2,500
OXFORDSHIRE CHINESE COMMUNITY & ADVICE	36,027
OXFORDSHIRE COMMUNITY & VOLUNTARY ACTION	29,486
OXFORDSHIRE COMMUNITY & VOLUNTARY ACTION - FURNITURE STORE	27,810
OXFORDSHIRE NATURE CONSERVATION FORUM	1,500
OXFORDSHIRE RACIAL EQUALITY COUNCIL	24,720
OXFORDSHIRE TOURING THEATRE COMPANY	8,720
OXFORDSHIRE WOMEN'S AID	18,169
OXSRAD	12,360
PARASOL	10,000
PEGASUS	26,459
PORCH STEPPIN STONE	50,000
REFUGEE RESOURCE	1,250
RELATE	4,500
ROSE HILL & DONNINGTON ADVICE CENTRE	62,233
SOUP KITCHEN	7,500
SOUTH OXFORD ADVENTURE PLAYGROUND	9,373
SS MARY & JOHN CHURCH YARD	1,373
THE BRIDGE	41,943
THE GAP	93,598
THE STORY MUSEUM	2,350
TRAX	2,931
Set aside for Bowls Clubs / Pavilions (maximum)	10,000
Arts Development Fund	10,000
Emergency Grants	10,000*
Small Grants	5,339
GRAND TOTAL	1,627,063*

* 50% of inflationary increase to be added to these figures

- (4) officers be asked to look into ways of simplifying the application form and application process for small grants.

288. WELFARE ADVICE PROVISION AND FUTURE FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

The Strategy and Review Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) advice centres continue to be funded separately if their funding applications for 2008/09 are successful under the community grants process and reinstate their 3 year funding status in this event;
- (2) outcomes for advice centres reflect Oxford City Council's Vision;
- (3) the Advice Forum meet quarterly to discuss social policy issues, negotiate with funders and identify areas for joint work, training and funding bids.

289. BOWLS CLUB CHARGING STRUCTURE

The Leisure and Cultural Services Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) the new charging structure for bowls for 2007/08, as set out in the report, be approved;
- (2) a full review of bowls provision and management be undertaken by the Parks Section in consultation with the bowls clubs.

290. COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING STRATEGY DIRECTORATE FUNDING ALLOCATION

The Community Housing Business Manager submitted recommendations (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) approval be given to the drawing down of the government allocation for the financial year 2007/08;
- (2) approval be given to the following grants to external agencies for 2007/08: -
 - 5 posts at the Street Services Team (Crime Reduction Initiatives) - £195,420
 - 1 Reconnection Worker (Crime Reduction Initiatives)- £43,274
 - 1 Substance Misuse worker, Simon House (6 month contract) -

£43,882

- 2 Resettlement Workers, ECHG - £59,415
- 1 Specialist Alcohol Worker, Night Shelter - £33,236
- 1 Tenancy Sustainment Worker, Night Shelter - £33,236
- 1 Prevention and Resettlement Worker, The Bridge Oxford - £31,165
- 1 Multiple Needs worker, Elmore Community Team - £37,768
- 1 Life Skills Worker, Simon House - £37,144
- Severe Weather Beds - £3,500
- Subsidised Service Charge for 4 x Young People at Simon House £2,486
- Activate – pre-detox course at ECHG - £6,000;

(3) approval be given to the following Oxford City Council posts/schemes for 2007/08: -

- Rough Sleeping and Single Homelessness Officer (Community Housing) - £14,000
- Home Choice Rent Deposit Scheme (Community Housing) - £15,000;

(4) the Community Housing Business Manager be authorised to allocate the balance of £44,474.

291. TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION ANNUAL RENT REVIEW

The Community Housing Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that: -

- (1) the net rent for private sector lease (PSL) units be set at £219.06 per week from 2 April 2007;
- (2) the PSL heating and lighting service charge be set at £13.50 per week from 2 April 2007;
- (3) the PSL water and sewerage service charge be set at £2.00 per week from 2 April 2007;
- (4) the Nightly Charge Accommodation rate be set at £183.75 per week ((£26.25 per night) inclusive, from 2 April 2007;
- (5) future annual reviews and setting of PSL rent, PSL service charges, and Nightly Charge rates be delegated to the Community Housing Business Manager.

292. ANNUAL LETTINGS PLAN – ALLOCATIONS PERCENTAGES

The Community Housing Business Manager submitted a report (previously

circulated and now appended). The Board also considered a recommendation of the Housing Scrutiny Committee, which had commented on the report at its meeting on 22 February 2007.

Resolved that: -

- (1) the Housing Scrutiny Committee be thanked for its helpful comments;
- (2) the performance against the Lettings Plan for April to December 2006/07 (Appendix 1) be noted;
- (3) the proposed Lettings Plan (Appendix 2) be endorsed as the target allocation percentages for 2007/08;
- (4) Council be RECOMMENDED to adopt the Lettings Plan for 2007/08, with the amendment recommended by Housing Scrutiny Committee which has led to a further increase for 3-bed properties being allocated to transfer applicants;
- (5) It be noted that it was not possible to further increase the percentage of 4-bed and larger properties, as recommended by Housing Scrutiny Committee, due to their expected scarcity this year and the need to have regard for the reasonable preference groups;
- (6) Officers be asked to look into how the housing needs of young offenders were being addressed.

293. REDEVELOPMENT OF LAND AT WYATT ROAD – VARIATION OF TERMS

The Community Housing Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that the report be considered alongside the exempt from publication appendix in part two of the meeting (minute 302 refers).

294. WESTGATE AND ALBION PLACE REDEVELOPMENT – APPROPRIATION OF SITES

The Strategic Director, Physical Environment, submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). The Board also considered comments from Councillor Sargent (Ward Councillor).

Resolved that: -

- (1) if the CPO is confirmed and to the extent that it is not already held for such purposes the land shown edged black on Plan 1 be appropriated for planning purposes as described in Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 and in Section 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on the date immediately before the Council makes a

vesting declaration or serves notice to treat pursuant to the confirmed CPO, such land being then no longer required for the purposes for which it is currently held;

- (2) to the extent that it is not already held for such purposes, the land shown edged black on Plan 2 be appropriated for planning purposes as described in Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 and in Section 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, with immediate effect.

295. OPTIONS FOR HRA PREMISES IN IFFLEY ROAD

The Financial and Asset Management Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended). Members were advised that the report was due to be considered by the Housing Advisory Board on 15 March 2007 but that meeting had not gone ahead because it was not quorate.

Resolved that the item be deferred to the next meeting in order to give the Housing Advisory Board an opportunity to consider the options

296. COVERED MARKET UNITS 65-68: CHANGE OF USE

The Financial and Asset Management Business Manager submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that approval be given to the assignment and change of use of Units 65-66, as set out in the report, and officers be authorised to negotiate terms of the assignment and change of use accordingly.

297. THIRD QUARTER 2006/07 PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Interim Chief Executive submitted a report (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that the report be noted.

298. AREA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services submitted a recommendation from the Central, South and West Area Committee concerning riverbank maintenance.

Resolved to note that a survey had been carried out, funding had been identified and a working group was being set up to discuss what repair work should be done with the available funds, and that longer term maintenance would be discussed once responsibilities were clear.

299. PORTFOLIO HOLDER QUESTIONS

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services submitted questions submitted to Portfolio Holders and responses to those questions (previously circulated and now appended). Councillor Sargent also addressed the Board.

Resolved to note: -

- (1) the questions from Councillors Sargent and MacGregor and the responses from Councillors Fooks and Armitage;
- (2) Councillor Sargent's comments about the benefits of Area Managers being involved with the implementation team throughout the rolling out process for the new waste collection and recycling scheme, as shown by experiences in the Carfax area.

300. DECISIONS TAKEN IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE COUNCIL

There were no such decisions for the Board to consider.

299. FUTURE ITEMS

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services submitted a list (previously circulated and now appended) of future agenda items.

Resolved to note the list of future items.

300. MINUTES

Resolved that the minutes (previously circulated) of meetings of the Board held on 19 and 26 February 2007 be approved as a correct record, subject to ...

301. MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION

Resolved that in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 21(1)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Schedule I2A of the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason for exemption</u>	<u>Minute No</u>
C1	information relating to the business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)	302

C2 information relating to the business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

303

302. REDEVELOPMENT OF LAND AT WYATT ROAD – VARIATION OF TERMS

The Community Housing Manager submitted a report and an exempt from publication appendix (previously circulated and now appended).

Resolved that approval be given to:-

- (1) the scheme proposal to develop seven family houses, as set out in the report;
- (2) changes to the terms for the disposal of the land under Contract Procedure Regulation 9.05 for the land to be transferred to Chiltern Hundreds Housing Association;
- (3) the change to the capital receipt reflecting the change in the value of the land, as set out in the exempt from publication Appendix at item C2 on the agenda.

303. OPTIONS FOR HRA PREMISES IN IFFLEY ROAD

This item was withdrawn.

The meeting began at 9.00 am, the press and public were excluded at 11.40 am and the meeting ended at 11.46 am.

ANNEX 1 to minute 281 of the Executive Board – 19 March 2007

Since the report on the Core Strategy Preferred Options document was written, officers have received further informal comments on the draft document including from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE). These comments have resulted in the need to make some changes to the document, which are outlined below:

Summary of proposed changes to Core Strategy Preferred Options document

Section of document	Suggested change	Reason for change
Various	Add new options where there are realistic and distinct alternatives to the preferred approaches put forward in the document See attached sheet	GOSE has commented that there are a number of sections where we have one preferred approach and no options. GOSE suggests that we need to be clear, either in the document or the Sustainability Appraisal, what other options have been looked at
Housing	Amend text on housing growth to reflect requirements of PPS3 regarding treatment of windfalls See attached sheet	To reflect comments received from GOSE
Health and Hospitals	Amend the preferred approach on Primary Care as follows: "To ensure that high quality convenient local health services are provided in all parts of Oxford in co-ordination with the PCT Strategic Services Development Plan, <u>e.g. in the City centre, possibly as part of the West End regeneration</u> "	To reflect comments received from the Primary Care Trust
Flooding	Amend wording of the text and options to provide greater clarity See attached sheet	Independent Assessment of the Sustainability Appraisal highlighted a lack of clarity between the preferred option and the alternative option
Waste and Recycling	Updated figures and clarification See attached sheet	To reflect comments received from City Works
Biodiversity	Distinguish between local and international/national designations, e.g. Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation is of European importance	To reflect comments received from GOSE

Strategic Locations for Development	<p>Add the following text to the first paragraph of the section on Broad Locations for Development as follows:</p> <p><u>“This section will identify other broad locations for development within Oxford’s boundaries. The City Council recognises, however, that the functioning of Oxford as a sustainable city does not stop at its administrative boundary, particularly in relation to the housing market and transport. We will continue to put the case for an urban extension to Oxford, and will work positively with the County Council and neighbouring districts on a Green Belt review should that be an eventual outcome of the South East Plan process.”</u></p>	GOSE has commented that little is said about cross border issues and working in the document, yet it is one of Oxford’s key issues
Brownfield land/Housing	<p>Add the following text regarding the distribution of future brownfield housing in the section on brownfield land:</p> <p><u>“A large amount of development in Oxford has occurred on previously developed (brownfield) land in the past. During 2005/06, 99% of housing completions in Oxford were on brownfield land, compared to the SEP target of 60%. <u>Housing monitoring figures (commitments, allocated sites, the West End and brownfield sites identified in the draft SHLAA) indicate that approximately 20% of future housing development on brownfield land will occur in the City centre with the remainder spread relatively evenly across the rest of Oxford.”</u></u></p>	GOSE suggests that more should be said about where the housing is going to go
Key Diagram	<p>Amend to show more clearly the proposed spatial distribution of centres, densities and transport links</p> <p style="text-align: center;">See attached sheet</p>	To reflect comments received from GOSE

Proposed Additional Options

Building on Oxford's economic strengths

Preferred option:

To promote development that builds on ~~recognise~~ Oxford's economic strengths in the fields of science and technology, education, biotech and spin-off companies from the Universities and hospitals. Provide the supporting infrastructure, including space, for the cluster of business activities necessary to support the managed growth of these key sectors.

Alternative option 1:

To promote greater diversity in the range and type of employment uses.

Alternative option 2:

Allow the market to determine the type and range of employment uses that it seeks to meet.

in

Protecting Oxford's Employment sites

Preferred option:

To protect key employment sites, which add to the diversity of the employment base, and allow regeneration and modernisation for a broad range of employment uses, particularly those related to Oxford's key sectors

Alternative option 1:

Do not provide any specific protection for key sites but allow their release to other uses, such as residential, to be assessed in the same way as non-protected sites.

Brownfield land

Preferred option: Development will be allowed on brownfield land subject to other relevant policies in the Core Strategy. Development will not be allowed on strategic greenfield sites as identified in the Core Strategy before ~~from~~ 1st April 2011.

Alternative option 1: Development will be allowed on brownfield land subject to other relevant policies in the Core Strategy. Allow the strategic Greenfield sites identified in the Core Strategy to come forward before 2011.

Alternative option 2: Development will be allowed on brownfield land subject to other relevant policies in the Core Strategy. Development will not be allowed on strategic greenfield sites as identified in the Core Strategy before 1st April 2016.

Tourism

Preferred option:

Promote sustainable tourism by encouraging longer stays and greater spend in Oxford by providing and adding to the quality of existing tourist attractions and by protecting and diversifying the range and amount of short-stay accommodation. Promote strategic spatial links with the Cotswolds emphasising Oxford's role as a gateway

Alternative option 1:

Promote major growth in tourism with a significant expansion in short-stay accommodation and the addition of new tourist attractions of a regional scale.

Alternative option 2:

Constrain tourism growth to allow only a minor increase in short-stay accommodation provision and no additional attractions

Green space

Preferred option:

Ensure that all Oxford residents have suitable access to safe, managed and well maintained areas of publicly accessible green space in line with the recommended distances in the Green Space Study. Priority for the creation of new green spaces will be given to areas with a significant shortage of open space provision.

Alternative option: Ensure that all Oxford residents have some access to safe, managed and well maintained areas of publicly accessible green space, but adopt a lower standard of green space provision than that recommended in the Oxford City Green Space Study in order to allow more land to be used for development.

Sports facilities

Preferred option:

Ensure that all Oxford residents have suitable access to a variety of indoor and outdoor sports facilities. Priority for the creation of new sports facilities will be given to areas with a significant shortage of sports facilities as identified in the Indoor Facilities Report and the Playing Pitch Assessment. Priorities for specific new local and regional sports facilities will be in line with the City Council's Leisure Strategy and Leisure Facilities Review, sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD.

Alternative option: Ensure that all Oxford residents have some access to a variety of indoor and outdoor sports facilities. Seek to improve provision by providing fewer but better quality facilities, with surplus facilities being used either for other recreational purposes or developed for other uses for which there is a need in the vicinity..