


Oxford Core Strategy Examination Statement of Oxford City Council		<a href="http://www.oxford.gov.uk">www.oxford.gov.uk</a>  <b>OXFORD CITY COUNCIL</b>
C/M6/1	<b>Matter 6 – Infrastructure</b> <b>Issue 1 – The infrastructure planning process</b>	

**i) Is key infrastructure appropriately defined, including reference to key providers?**

The supporting text to Policy CS18 lists (in bullet point form) the four main types of infrastructure that need to be considered in supporting new development. Policy CS18 expands on this by identifying more specifically the key areas of infrastructure improvements identified through stakeholder working. The policy does not seek to identify very specific types of infrastructure within these as to do so would unnecessarily duplicate Policy CC7 and the accompanying table in the South East Plan (CD10/1). However cross-reference is made to other relevant policies within the Core Strategy, for example with regard to local community infrastructure there is a reciprocated cross-reference to Policies CS20 and CS21, relating to community safety infrastructure (such as appropriate lighting) and the provision of community facilities.

The glossary defines ‘infrastructure’ through cross-reference to the South East Plan. It is acknowledged, however, that cross-reference to the definition of infrastructure set out in the South East Plan may be a helpful addition to the policy, for example through addition of a line at the end of the policy stating: “A full definition of infrastructure is included in the South East Plan”.

Reference to key providers of infrastructure is made in Section 9.1 – Implementation, in relation to Policy CS18 (page 125). This list is not exhaustive, but highlights those partners that are likely to be most involved in the delivery of the development proposed in the Core Strategy. Further references are made in Section 9.1 for other policies promoting appropriate improvements to infrastructure, for example CS12 (working with Environment Agency on flood mitigation infrastructure); CS14 (working with the County Council and Highways Agency on transport infrastructure), CS16 and CS17 (Primary Care Trust and County education services respectively), and CS20 (partnership working with Thames Valley Police and the Safer Communities Partnership).

**ii) What are key infrastructure projects that underlie the achievement of the Core Strategy?**

Infrastructure projects that the City Council consider crucial to the delivery of the spatial strategy (in terms of delivering strategic growth) are summarised in the following table, which also outlines funding streams, and identifies where reference is made within the Core Strategy:

<b>Project / Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Core Strategy policy requirement</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Phasing</b>	<b>Lead infrastructure delivery agent(s)</b>
West End supporting infrastructure (which may include appropriate dry access infrastructure)	CS5 – West End	Developer contributions (West End Partnership), New Growth Point, Access to Oxford	Concurrent with development (2009-16) – details in WEAAP Appendix 9	Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council, SEEDA
Northern Gateway transport mitigation measures	CS6 – Northern Gateway	Northern Gateway Consortium (scheme integration with Access to Oxford)	To be determined through the AAP process	Northern Gateway Consortium (joint working required)
Barton supporting infrastructure (access and primary school places are key)	CS7 – Land at Barton	Developer contributions, HCA, County Council	To be determined through the AAP process	City Council coordinating through AAP process

Since adoption of the West End AAP (CD7/5), the Environment Agency has raised some concerns over securing dry access to some of the identified sites in times of flooding (based on the 1 in 200 year flood zone). The City Council consider that through the careful design of schemes for sites (Flood Risk Assessments will be required through the planning process) and the public realm projects planned (where streets and spaces will be redesigned and re-laid), it will be possible to secure an access route from sites in the West End to the remainder of the city centre which lies outside the area of risk. This may be informed by a Flood Risk Management Plan (or something similar) for the West End, subject to further joint working with the EA. Further detail on this issue, and other supporting infrastructure towards achieving spatial objectives in the West End, is set out in Council Statement C/M8/2 – West End.

More detail on infrastructure requirements at Barton and Northern Gateway respectively is set out in Council Statements C/M8/1 and C/M8/3. A robust transport strategy will be required to incorporate a range of mitigation measures at the Northern Gateway; this is being taken forward through the AAP process, and its development is already well underway. Ongoing joint working with the Highways Agency on this aspect is confirmed in the Statement of Common Ground submitted on 9<sup>th</sup> June. Similarly at Barton, the identified need for a crossing facility over the A40, to integrate the new development with the rest of Oxford, is being taken forward as part of the ongoing development of options for the forthcoming Barton AAP.

A further project considered key to supporting sub-regional economic and housing growth throughout Central Oxfordshire sub-region is the Access to Oxford package. As Oxford is at the heart of the sub-region, and given the strong policy steer in the South East Plan for Oxford to support future growth, it follows that Access to Oxford has a major role in supporting growth specific to Oxford, albeit primarily addressing the projected increase in traffic generally within the sub-region. It should however be stressed that whilst delivering growth in Oxford would be more challenging if Access to Oxford did not come forward, there are other mitigating schemes and factors that suggest the level of growth proposed in the Core Strategy would still be achieved. This is considered in detail in Council Statement C/M7/1.

<b>Project / Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Core Strategy policy requirement</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Phasing</b>	<b>Lead responsibility</b>
Access to Oxford (package of major transport improvements)	CS14 (supporting text)	Oxfordshire County Council	Oxford Station Improvements – 2010/11 Remaining elements – 2013-16	Oxfordshire County Council

The measures summarised above are in each case to be delivered via a number of integrated projects, which cannot be defined fully until further work has been carried out (through the AAPs for the strategic sites, and Access to Oxford major scheme bids respectively). More detailed statements on this issue are found in Council Statements C/M8/1, C/M8/3, and C/M7/1 respectively.

It should be clarified that there are various other infrastructure projects seen as vital to achieving in full the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy, but upon which delivery of the proposed housing and economic growth does not depend in a purely functional sense. Examples are increasing affordable housing; local improvements to bus priority and the local movement network (e.g. the orbital bus routes and routes linking Oxford to the SDA); public realm improvements (particularly in the City centre); enhanced community facilities and local connectivity in the regeneration areas, and improvements to the cycle and pedestrian networks. These are highlighted in the relevant Core Strategy policies (and are generally expected to come forward through the development management process and/or longer term partnership working with other bodies as appropriate).

**iii) What are their costs, phasing, funding sources and who is responsible for delivering them?**

The West End Area Action Plan considers the need for supporting infrastructure (Policy WE19). Developer contributions are subject to a Streamlined Contributions framework, and delivery of the AAP is through the West End Partnership. The operational plan of the Primary Care Trust (CD13/3) refers to completing preliminary work to determine the need for future primary care provision in the West End. Further

details are set out in the West End AAP (CD7/5) including a Delivery, Implementation and Monitoring Framework in Appendix 9 of the AAP.

In the case of Barton and Northern Gateway strategic sites, the costs and funding will themselves depend on development of detailed implementation plans through the AAP process. The City Council is working closely with the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) on developing options on the Barton site, and the HCA have committed significant funding to support this work. The intention is for development at Barton to be brought forward quickly following adoption of the AAP. The City Council is also working closely with the Northern Gateway Consortium of developers, who have a longstanding commitment to planning and funding the transport mitigation measures required to deliver the development. The development will be phased over a ten-year period (2010/11–2021), with associated transport improvements phased to complement both the development itself, and the Northern Approaches element of Access to Oxford.

The provisional budget for Access to Oxford is £88 million as set out in the Regional Funding Advice to Government (see CD10/7 and CD10/8). £62 million is allocated by the Regional Transport Board, to be phased over the period 2013/14 to 2015/16 (with the exception of £6million to be brought forward for 2010/11 for improvements to Oxford Railway Station). Detailed elements of the Access to Oxford package, in terms of funding, costings and timescales of individual projects, will be subject to major scheme bids to the Department for Transport.

It is recognised that the revised PPS12 advises that the Core Strategy should consider who will provide infrastructure to support growth in the area, and when it will be provided, irrespective of whether or not the local authority itself is responsible for its delivery. In the case of the Oxford Core Strategy, all key service infrastructure providers have been consulted at each stage of the plan preparation process. Officers have held meetings to understand these other providers' spending plans, and the role of the Core Strategy in either supporting or informing these. An outline infrastructure schedule relating to the Core Strategy, and setting out information available at the current time, can be found in Appendix 1.

**iv) What are the implications of them not coming forward as planned?**

The City Council is of the view that there are no real showstopper issues that would prevent necessary infrastructure in the West End coming forward. It is, of course, recognised that without improvements to the movement network, public realm, and community and green infrastructure, new developments will not be able to operate efficiently and opportunity will have been lost to maximise improvements to the area and secure the vision. It is likely that the sites would still be developable even without some of these – what would be compromised is the vision and the quality of

the end product. In terms of dry access to mitigate future flood events that may arise from climate change, the City Council continues to work with the Environment Agency to ensure that this issue is given due prominence in the detailed planning stages.

For the Northern Gateway project, a package of transport mitigation measures will be integral to the masterplanning of the development as a whole. Given the wording of Policy CS14 with regards to the Northern Gateway AAP, development will necessarily be of a nature that can be supported by appropriate transport mitigation. If any element of the agreed transport package were not to come forward as expected, a more gradual phasing would be required to give more time to secure necessary improvements. Failing this, a change in the balance of development mix, for example to reduce the quantity of B1 uses, may be appropriate. If either of these were found inappropriate, imposing a ceiling either on the provision of parking, or on the scale of development overall, may be necessary to ensure that traffic congestion is not further worsened by the development. These contingency scenarios may need to be considered in the Northern Gateway AAP. However they are unlikely to be needed, given that the development itself will contribute significant investment towards transport improvements, adding to and enhancing the significant investment expected from Access to Oxford.

For the Barton project, large-scale access improvements are not considered critical to the delivery of housing development *per se*, but are nevertheless vital to ensure that the extension to the urban area is integrated with the rest of Oxford, and ensure the impact on existing communities is mitigated. It is however recognised that an increase in primary school places will be needed to cope with the increased population in the area. A failure to provide these in the local area could be offset through expanding primary schools elsewhere, although care would be needed in implementing such a contingency to overcome operational challenges that may arise. The Barton AAP will identify the most appropriate means of provision for the additional primary school places.

The implications of Access to Oxford improvements not coming forward are considered in Council Statement C/M7/1.

**v) Does the Core Strategy provide an appropriate level of guidance on this?**

The Core Strategy fully reflects the need for the key infrastructure improvements identified above. Policies CS6 and CS7, and their supporting text, provide a clear framework providing a basis for taking forward the respective AAPs for Northern Gateway and Barton. For example, the supporting text for Policy CS6 states that *“the highways and transport mitigation measures will need to be resolved before any development takes place”*, and the policy itself states that *“Development*

*proposals will be expected to incorporate a balanced package of transport mitigation measures, including capacity improvements and highways and demand management measures to complement the Access to Oxford improvements to the Northern Gateway.” Similarly, key outputs set out in the supporting text to CS7 include “to provide access for new residents to the appropriate services and facilities, to include in particular: primary and secondary education (this is likely to require either expansion of at least two existing primary schools, or an additional school within the site itself)... [etc.]”. Policy CS17 – Access to education also states “Strategic housing development at Barton, and potentially at Summertown, will make provision for or contribute towards appropriate primary education facilities, either on- or off-site.”*

In relation to Access to Oxford, the main elements of the package (together with other complementing schemes such as East-West Rail and the new Evergreen 3 Bicester/London rail link) are listed in Section 5.1 – Transport and Accessibility. As the project relates to the sub-region rather than just Oxford, and is being taken forward by the County Council, these were not included in a formal policy, but are given as contextual to the policies of the Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy sets out in Section 9.1 an Implementation Plan for all policies within the document. This includes details of funding sources and the organisations responsible for delivery. Section 9.2 – Monitoring broadly identifies development phasing relating to the main areas of growth, although it should be recognised that there will be detailed delivery and monitoring plans included in the AAPs.

There is a good degree of certainty that the key infrastructure identified will come forward. This is in the context that the South East Plan requires significant housing and economic growth in and around Oxford, and that there are few realistic alternative options to those proposed in the Core Strategy to accommodate this. It is therefore imperative that the key providers of infrastructure work together on this premise to ensure timely delivery of the infrastructure needed to support growth (as identified in the South East Plan, Oxford Core Strategy, and the LDFs of neighbouring authorities). This partnership approach is strongly reflected in the wording of Policy CS18, and throughout the Core Strategy.

## Appendix 1- Outline infrastructure schedule

	<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Indicative cost</b>	<b>Lead delivery agency</b>	<b>Funding source</b>	<b>Indicative phasing</b>
1	Blackbird Leys Swimming Pool	CS4	£7 million	Oxford City Council in partnership with Fusion Leisure	Oxford City Council, Sport England (potential), developer contributions	Unknown at present
2	Blackbird Leys tower block improvement	CS4	Unknown – subject to options appraisal	Oxford City Homes	Oxford City Homes capital & grant funds	Options appraisal ongoing
3	Oxford & Cherwell Valley College (Blackbird Leys campus) modernisation	CS4	£16 million	Oxford and Cherwell Valley College	Learning and Skills Council, Oxford and Cherwell Valley College capital funds	Unknown at present
4	Plowman tower block improvement	CS4	Unknown – subject to options appraisal	Oxford City Homes	Oxford City Homes capital & grant funds	Options appraisal ongoing
5	Rose Hill housing regeneration project	CS4	£20m	Greensquare/ Taylor Wimpey	Developer / RSL with Social Housing Grant funding	2008-12
6	Rose Hill multi-functional community facility	CS4	£8m	Oxford City Council/ County Council partnership	Private developer / County Council / developer contributions	2012 start
7	Foresters Tower Block improvement	CS4	Unknown – subject to options appraisal	Oxford City Homes	Oxford City Homes capital & grant funds	Options appraisal ongoing
8	Redevelop Wood Farm Primary School	CS4	Unknown	Oxfordshire County Council	Primary Capital Programme	Known to be high priority

9	Dry access infrastructure	CS5	Arrangements to be made through joint working with Environment Agency			
10	West End public realm improvements	CS5	£12 million (for West End AAP projects – further funding from Transform Oxford)	Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council	Developer contributions, New Growth Point, County transport funding	Phase 1: 2009/10 Phase 2: 2010/11 Phase 3: 2012/13 Phase 4: 2013/14
11	Oxford Rail Station enhancement (inc. new bay platform)	CS5	£25 million	Network Rail, Oxfordshire County Council	Network Rail capital funding, Access to Oxford	2010/11
12	Frideswide Square remodelling	CS5	£4 million	Oxfordshire County Council	Developer contributions, County transport funding	2011/12
13	New Thames cycle & pedestrian bridge	CS5	£0.75 million	Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council	Developer contributions, County transport funds	2011/12
14	West End District Heating System	CS5	£0.8 million (procurement only)	Oxford City Council	West End Partnership funding	2010/11
15	Northern Gateway Transport Strategy	CS6	Unknown at present – to be determined through AAP	Northern Gateway Consortium	Northern Gateway Consortium masterplan / contributions	Unknown at present – to be determined through AAP
16	A40 bus, pedestrian and cycle crossing (Northway)	CS7	£2.6 million	Homes and Communities Agency, Oxford City Council	Developer contributions	Unknown at present – to be determined through AAP

17	A40 pedestrian crossing (Barton Lane)	CS7	£0.77 million	Homes and Communities Agency, Oxford City Council	Developer contributions	Unknown at present – to be determined through AAP
18	School places, social and community facilities to serve Barton	CS7	Unknown at present – to be determined through AAP	Oxfordshire County Council, Oxford City Council	Developer contributions	Unknown at present – to be determined through AAP
19	New or extended bus service	CS7	Likely to be provided commercially	Bus Operating Companies (subject to detailed discussion)	Likely to be provided commercially; potential developer contributions for early 'pump-priming'	Unknown at present – to be determined through AAP
20	Access to Oxford – package of schemes	CS14 (supporting text)	£88 million	Oxfordshire County Council	Regional Funding Allocation; County transport funding	2013-15 (except Oxford Station – see above)
	Evergreen 3 – Oxford-Bicester-London rail link	CS14 (supporting text)	Unknown – commercial funding stream	Chiltern Railways	Chiltern Railways 20-year investment-led franchise	2011-13 (service commencement May 2013)
21	East-West Rail	CS14 (supporting text)	£190 – 228 million	East-West Rail Consortium	Various public funding streams plus developer contributions	Implementation likely to be 2013 at earliest
22	Orbital bus network (supporting bus priority infrastructure)	CS15	Unknown at present	Oxfordshire County Council	LTP3, developer contributions	Unknown at present – to be determined through LTP3

23	Park and Ride enhancement	CS15	£4 million for Thornhill expansion	Oxfordshire County Council	LTP3, developer contributions	Likely to be in period 2011-16
24	Cowley transport interchange improvements	CS15	Unknown at present	Developers / Oxfordshire County Council	Developer masterplan / contributions	Unknown at present – to come forward with future development
25	City centre pedestrian and cycle priority measures	CS15	As scheme 10 above			
26	Cycle network development (City-wide)	CS15	Unknown at present	Oxfordshire County Council	LTP3, developer contributions	Likely to be in period 2011-16 (small schemes ongoing)
27	20mph zone rollout (to cover most of City)	CS15	£308,000 (not inc. publicity and ongoing revenue)	Oxfordshire County Council	Oxfordshire County Council capital programme	2009/10
28	Primary healthcare provision to meet population growth	CS16	Unknown at present	Oxfordshire NHS (Primary Care Trust)	Oxfordshire NHS, developer contributions	To align with forecast housing and population growth
29	Provision of school places to meet general population growth	CS17	Unknown at present – between 1058 and 1439 additional primary places anticipated by peak year (2021)	Oxfordshire County Council	Developer contributions, County capital funds	To align with forecast housing and population growth
30	Oxford flood alleviation scheme	CS18	£100 million	Environment Agency	Environment Agency capital programme	Phase 1 – 2013 commencement Phase 2 – 2025 commencement