

Note The examination will proceed on the basis that the Revised Submission Core Strategy, March 2009, which has been subject to a formal 6 week public consultation period, represents the Council's preferred plan. Accordingly, all specific references to the Core Strategy relate to the Revised Submission version. For the avoidance of doubt, all policy reference numbers relate to the Revised Submission version.

- - **No statement submitted**

Note ii) The Council will be represented at the hearings by:
 Michael Crofton-Briggs - Head of City Development
 Mark Jaggard - Spatial and Economic Development Manager
 Adrian Roche - Team Leader Planning Policy
 Laura Goddard - Principal Planner
 Tom Morris - Principal Planner
 Rachel Williams - Principal Planner
 Matthew Bates - Senior Planner
 Richard Wyatt - Planner
 Kerrie Gaughan - Planner

**MATTER 1 - PROCEDURAL/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND GENERAL ISSUES
TUESDAY 14 JULY 10.00 AM**

Participants

Oxford City Council	Headington & St Clements Residents' Associations
Oxford Brookes University	Kier Property/Worcester College, Merton College and Goodman
Oxford Preservation Trust	Rose Hill Tenants Association
Oxfordshire City & County Archaeological Forum/ Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	ENGAGE
Oxfordshire Green Party	Mr Sean Feeney

1 Have all the Legal Requirements been met?

- Has the Core Strategy been prepared in accordance with the **Local Development Scheme (LDS)**?
- What does the latest LDS say?
- Has the Core Strategy been prepared in accordance with the **Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**?
- What evidence is there that this is the case?
- Has the Core Strategy been prepared in accordance with the **Regulations**?
- What evidence is there that this is the case?
- Has the Core Strategy been subject to a **Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**?
- What options were examined in the SA?

- What prompted the choice of those options?
- Were there other reasonable options that might have been chosen, but not fully considered?
- Where is the evidence that the options have been weighed and assessed, with the most appropriate strategy being pursued?
- How was the choice of the preferred option made and on what basis does the Council consider the chosen one is the most appropriate?
- Does the Sustainability Appraisal satisfy all legal requirements placed upon it?
 - Does it do all that is necessary to meet requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive?
 - Is any further information needed in any respect?
- Is it deficient in any way that might call into question its legality?

- Has the Core Strategy had regard to **National Policy**? (This will be considered as part of the discussions on the other matters)

- Does the Core Strategy conform generally to the **Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)**?
 - Now that the RSS has been adopted (with a requirement for the southern urban extension), the CS appears to be in general conformity with the RSS?
 - What does the RSS require of Oxford?
 - How does it intend to meet those requirements and the strategy laid down by the RSS?
 - Should any weight at all now be given to the Structure Plan?

- Has the Core Strategy had regard to the sustainable community strategy?
- How has the linkage been made?
 - How has the longer term perspective of this Core Strategy been able to take on board the shorter term timescales of the community strategy?

2 General issues

Issues facing the City to 2026

- Where are the issues defined that the City is facing to 2026?
- Does the Core Strategy “key challenges” set these out clearly enough?
- How are these prioritised and how do these issues feed through into the Vision and Strategy?

Role of the Core Strategy

- Does the length of the document detract from the message?
- What subsequent Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are the Council planning to prepare?
- Does the Core Strategy, as revised, provide sufficient guidance for subsequent DPDs and SPDs, or is too much of the strategy left for future DPDs to determine?

MATTER 2 - THE STRATEGY
TUESDAY 14 JULY AT 2.00 PM (NOTE ISSUES 1-4 ONLY)

Participants

Oxford City Council	South Oxfordshire DC
Homes & Communities Agency (No statement)	Headington and St Clements Residents' Associations
Oxfordshire Green Party	Kier Property/Worcester College, Merton College and Goodman
Oxford Preservation Trust	Rose Hill Tenants Association
Oxfordshire County Council	Mr Rodrigo
Oxford Brookes University	Mr Sean Feeney

1 The development of the strategy

- What have been the principal concerns that have dictated the strategy?
- What has led to the identification of strategic locations for development?
- How and why were these strategic locations chosen; are they the most appropriate locations for major development?
- Were other opportunities identified and then rejected? If not, are there other potential strategic locations that might be included?

2 Place making and how the various parts of the city are intended to change

- Is the plan sufficiently explicit as to how individual parts of the City will be changed and how the various themes come together to affect specific, individual areas?
- Could the plan be more explicit about the mix and scale of development and specific proposals proposed for each sub area?

3 The Regeneration Areas

- How were the Regeneration Areas identified?
- Does the Core Strategy take an adequately pro-active and targeted approach to deal with the areas of multiple deprivation?
- Should the Core Strategy say more about the steps the Council intends to take to ensure that development and other actions achieve the objectives for each of these areas?

4 Spatial planning

- Is the plan sufficiently spatial in its approach, or does it unduly concentrate upon land use development?
- Should and could more be said about other land use programmes, such as in education, health and social services?
- Should and could more be said about other, non-land use spatial programmes and initiatives?

MATTER 2 - THE STRATEGY
WEDNESDAY 15 JULY AT 10.00 AM
NOTE ISSUE 5 ONLY

Participants

Oxford City Council	Magdalen College & Thames Water Property
Oxfordshire CC	Goodman
CPRE (Oxfordshire/Oxford District)	Ms N Young
Oxford Preservation Trust	Oxfordshire Green Party
Merton College (Joint Statement with Goodman)	Mr Sean Feeney
Oxford Green Belt Network	ENGAGE

5 The Green Belt

- Should a more general review of the Green Belt have been undertaken in order to identify potential further areas for growth?
- What is meant by "small-scale review" of Green Belt boundaries?
- Why is this necessary?
- Would this create unnecessary uncertainty?

MATTER 3 - RETAILING AND THE HIERARCHY OF CENTRES
WEDNESDAY 15 JULY AT 2.00 PM

Participants

Oxford City Council	British Rail Board (Residuary) Ltd
South Oxfordshire DC	Zurich Assurance
Ms N Young	LaSalle Investment Management
Kyarra Sarl	Oxfordshire Green Party
Mr Sean Feeney	

1 The hierarchy of centres

- How and why was this particular hierarchy defined?
- Could the Core Strategy be more explicit about the amount and type of development proposed for each level and location?
- What steps does the Council intend to take to ensure that development achieves the objectives for each of these areas?

2 Retail need

- What is the scale of need for additional retailing across the City?
- What is the evidence base for this assessment? Is this as up-to-date as possible?
- What assumptions should be made about the latter half of the plan period?

3 Retail provision

- What is the overall strategy for retailing?
- What underlies the distribution of new retailing shown in the table prior to policy CS32?
- How, in practice, is that new retailing to be achieved?
- What is the Core Strategy's policy towards out of centre retailing?

4 Local centres

- How sustainable is intended growth in the local centres?
- Are the centres supported by appropriate and achievable access arrangements?
- Should the plan give an indication of appropriate or upper levels of new floorspace in local centres?
- Does the terminology sit comfortably with that of PPS6?

5 Monitoring and Implementation

- Are the targets and milestones for retailing realistic and in sufficient detail to enable careful monitoring of delivery and possible remedial action?

**MATTER 4- EMPLOYMENT
FRIDAY 17 JULY AT 10.00 AM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Michael Crofton-Briggs Mark Jaggard Tom Morris Adrian Roche (Issue 1) Kerrie Gaughan (Issue 4)	Kier Property/Worcester College, Merton College and Goodman
Oxfordshire CC	SEEDA
Oxford Green Belt Network	South Oxfordshire DC
Oxfordshire Green Party	Magdalen College & Thames Water Property
ENGAGE	Mr Sean Feeney*
CPRE	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch

1 The balance between homes and jobs

- What is the existing balance between jobs and homes and what is the extent and degree of problems that results?
- What sort of balance, if any, should the Core Strategy be seeking to establish? Should it be more explicit on this issue?
- What would this mean in terms of the strategy for jobs, bearing in mind that the RSS sets out a clear minimum target for additional dwellings?
- How does this equate with the desire to “manage economic growth”, the regional, strategic role of the City and the promotion of the economic prosperity of the area?
- Should the Core Strategy set out more explicitly how it would seek to achieve a better balance?
- How in practice could the number of jobs and number of homes be brought into a better balance?

2 Employment land requirements

- What is the requirement for new employment land provision, bearing in mind the above and the RSS strategy?
- How much land/jobs should the Core Strategy be seeking to provide?
- What are implications on levels and timing of delivery of seeking to achieve a balance between housing and employment development over the period to 2026?

3 Employment land supply

- Should the Core Strategy be more explicit about the quantitative provision for new employment land?
- Should the Core Strategy more clearly show how that scale of provision is to be provided, along with an indication of the locational spread of new land/sites for employment?

- How realistic is it that the Northern Gateway and West End areas will produce the required scale of employment development?
- Will these 2 strategic sites, together with the key employment sites, provide sufficient opportunity and scope to meet the continuing needs of all existing and future businesses?
- Are there any other suitable opportunities to provide for future employment needs that should be indicated in the Core Strategy?
 - Will a flexible, responsive supply of land be maintained over the period to 2026?
 - What is the evidence to support the retention of employment sites?

4 Other issues

- Does the Core Strategy fully and properly recognise the importance of the City tourist trade?

5 Monitoring and Implementation

- Are the targets and milestones for employment realistic and in sufficient detail to enable careful monitoring of delivery and possible remedial action?

**MATTER 5 - HOUSING
TUESDAY 21 JULY AT 10.00 AM
(NOTE ISSUES 1-6 ONLY)**

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Laura Goddard Tim Hunter Matthew Bates (Issue 5)	Oxford Brookes University
Christ Church	Kier Property/Worcester College, Merton College and Goodman
Showmen's Guild of Great Britain	New Marston (South) Residents' Association
Headington and St Clements Residents' Associations	Oxfordshire Green Party
ENGAGE	CPRE
Magdalen College & Thames Water Property	Mr Sean Feeney*
Oxford Radcliffe Hospital NHS Trust	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch

1 Housing land supply

A The requirement

- If the opportunities are available, should the plan not seek to provide more than the RSS requirement, treating it as a minimum figure, allowing for development beyond the 8,000 dwellings?
- If so, what are the implications for the plan's approach to housing provision?

B Provision for new housing

- Does the plan make adequate quantitative provision for new housing?
- Is there a sound evidence base to justify the figures given in Appendix 4?
- What does the SHLAA say about the capacity of the area to deliver this level of housing?
- Is there at least a 15 year supply of identifiable land available or, if not possible for years 11-15, are the broad locations realistic?
- Does the plan inappropriately rely on a 30% windfall development over the first 15 years?
- Could other sites have been identified?
- How robust and flexible is the supply to meet immediate needs?
- How is the supply to be managed?
- Should there be further contingency sites?

Area specific provision

- How realistic are the figures given in Appendix 4 for each of the identified broad type of sites?

the residential allocated sites;
sites with planning permission;
"basic desktop study" sites;
the CS strategic sites?

For each of these types:

- What is the evidence that the sites are available?
- What potential constraints/opportunities are there?
- What does delivery depend upon?
- Do the broad locations represent a sustainable pattern for new development?
- When is development likely to come forward?

2 Densities

- Does the plan contain sufficient information/is it sufficiently clear on appropriate densities?
- Does the Core Strategy approach properly reflect RSS guidance?
- Should the density requirements be more prescriptive?

3 A balanced mix of homes

- What is meant by a balanced mix of housing?
- What is the evidence that supports such an approach? Does it properly reflect the SHMA?
- Should the detail be left to an SPD?
- How should achieving a balanced mix be reflected in policy and practice?
- Have all types of specialist housing been sufficiently considered? (e.g. Extra Care Housing)

4 Affordable housing

- What is the basis of the 50% benchmark figure in policy CS25?
- What is the justification for a percentage figure higher than that of the RSS?
- What is the overall target for the City?
- What evidence is there of the viability/feasibility that has led to the policy approach?
- Were these exercises realistic and appropriately carried out, particularly bearing in mind current economic difficulties?
- Does the policy properly reflect the guidance in PPS3?
- Does the policy provide suitable flexibility to allow for viability and site circumstances to be taken into account?
- What is the justification for requiring affordable housing from commercial developments?
- Does this approach have any national/regional support?
- Would it hinder the achievement of the required commercial development?
- Is the approach to key worker housing appropriate?
- Does the policy CS25 relate to student accommodation?

5 Provision for gypsies

- Is the approach to gypsy site provision in policy CS27 the appropriate one, having regard to national and RSS guidance?
- Is the Core Strategy right to rely on a criteria-based approach or should it be more specific in terms of the location and suitability of certain sites/development areas?
- Should there be a reference to transit sites?

6 Existing housing stock

- Should more be said about the role and care of the existing housing stock?
 - Should more detail be given of programmes to improve the existing housing stock?
 - Is a policy needed to tackle the issue of concentrations of student housing within certain areas of the city and the problems that brings?
-
- Are the targets and milestones for housing realistic and in sufficient detail to enable careful monitoring of delivery and possible remedial action?
 - Should there be progressive targets and milestones to enable more effective monitoring?

MATTER 5 - HOUSING
WEDNESDAY 22 JULY AT 10.00 AM
(NOTE ISSUE 7 ONLY)

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Adrian Roche	Oxford Brookes University
Headington and St Clements Residents' Associations	Oxfordshire Green Party
New Marston (South) Residents' Association Dr S Mallett	CPRE (Oxfordshire/Oxford District) Mrs Rosemary Harris
Friends of Warneford Meadow Councillor Nuala Young	Mr Sean Feeney* Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch

7 Student accommodation

- Why is policy CS26 considered necessary?
- What is the current student accommodation position in the City?
- Why is the limit set at 3,000?
- What would be the implications for the 2 universities of the application of this policy?
- Is there realistic potential for universities to provide further residential accommodation for students, or would this policy serve to unreasonably limit the potential growth of the universities?
- If so, where would this be? Should the policy go to identify where and how further student accommodation could be provided?
- Is the restriction proposed in the final paragraph of the policy, to those in full-time education, reasonable and appropriate?
- Does policy CS31 have any implications for the provision of student accommodation?
- Should any exceptions be made to the requirement of policy CS26 that students do not bring cars to Oxford?

**MATTER 6-INFRASTRUCTURE
WEDNESDAY 22 JULY AT 2.00 PM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Adrian Roche Rachel Williams Matthew Bates	Christ Church
Oxfordshire CC	Kier Property/Worcester College, Merton College and Goodman
Environment Agency	ENGAGE
Highways Agency	Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
Primary Care Trust (No statement)	Oxfordshire Green Party
Thames Valley Police	Mr Sean Feeney*
Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch	

1 The infrastructure planning process

- Is key infrastructure appropriately defined, including reference to key providers?
- What are the key infrastructure projects that underlie the achievement of the Core Strategy?
- What are their costs, phasing, funding sources and who is responsible for delivering them?
- What are the implications of them not coming forward as planned?
- Does the Core Strategy provide an appropriate level of guidance on this?

2 Policy CS18 – Infrastructure and developer contributions

- Does the policy properly reflect the guidance in Circular 5/05?
- Does the approach accommodate changing economic circumstances?
- What are the priorities between the various infrastructure requirements and how will these be prioritised?

**MATTER 7-TRANSPORT
FRIDAY 24 JULY AT 10.00 AM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Adrian Roche Matthew Bates	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch
Oxfordshire CC	Kier Property/Worcester College, Merton College and Goodman
South Oxfordshire DC	ENGAGE
Highways Agency	CPRE
Oxfordshire Green Party	Mr Sean Feeney*
Oxford Pedestrians Association	Mr Rodrigo
Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch	

1 Transport strategy

- What is the strategy to cope with high and rising rates of congestion?
- How does the transport strategy reflect and relate to the LTP?
- Is the Core Strategy over-reliant upon schemes that have yet to have their funding confirmed?
- How will the road network, including the A34, cope with increased housing and employment development?

2 Sustainable transport

- How will the policies actually achieve the desired goal of reducing the need to travel?
- Should public transport, cycling and walking have greater emphasis, with more detail spelt out as to what is to be done?
- How will demand be managed and people encouraged to use non car modes?
- What evidence is there that the objectives of, and items set out in, policy CS15 can be achieved?
- What funding is available and what would developers be expected to contribute?
- The policies and delivery are relatively vague – Can the Core Strategy be more specific, giving details against which progress could better be measured?
- What changes are expected in particular areas, especially within the City centre?

3 Monitoring and Implementation

- Are the targets and milestones for transport realistic and in sufficient detail to enable careful monitoring of delivery and possible remedial action?

**MATTER 8 – THE STRATEGIC LOCATIONS
TUESDAY 28 JULY AT 10.00 AM**

1 West End

Participants

Oxford City Council Adrian Roche Rachel Williams Kerrie Gaughan	Oxford Preservation Trust*
Christ Church	British Rail Board (Residuary) Ltd
Environment Agency	CPRE
Oxfordshire Green Party	Mr Sean Feeney*
Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch	

- What process led to the identification of this area?
- What land/sites are likely to be available? What capacity do they have and what is the likely scale of development?
- What potential constraints/opportunities are there?
- What does delivery depend upon?
- When is development likely to come forward?
- Does the Core Strategy need to say more about this area, given that there is an adopted Area Action Plan for it?

2 Barton

Participants

Oxford City Council Adrian Roche Rachel Williams Kerrie Gaughan	Homes and Communities Agency (No statement)
Mr Sean Feeney*	Oxfordshire Green Party
Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch	

- What process led to the identification of this area? Why is it considered to be a sustainable location for development?
- Are there better alternative sites to this?
- What land is likely to be available for development?
- What is the most appropriate scale and mix of uses?
- What potential constraints and potential impacts are there and can these be overcome?
- What happens if they cannot be overcome?
- What infrastructure does successful delivery depend upon?
- When is development likely to come forward?
- How can this development be integrated into the surrounding area?

TUESDAY 28 JULY AT 2.00 PM

3 Summertown

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Adrian Roche Laura Goddard	Oxford Green Belt Network
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	Oxford Preservation Trust*
Councillor McCready	Oxfordshire Green Party
Councillor Fooks	Mr Sean Feeney*
CPRE	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch
ENGAGE	

- What process led to the identification of this area? Why is it considered to be a sustainable location for development?
- Are there better alternative sites to this?
- What evidence is there that it would be likely to come forward within the Plan period?
- What impact would the development have on the surrounding area, including the Meadows?

4 South Oxford Strategic Development Area

Participants

Oxford City Council Michael Crofton-Briggs Mark Jaggard Laura Goddard	Brasenose College
South Oxfordshire DC	Magdalen College/Thames Water
CPRE	Hallam Land/Bloor Homes
Oxford Green Belt Network	Oxford Preservation Trust
Horspath Parish Council	Oxfordshire Green Party
Mr Sean Feeney*	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch
Councillor Elizabeth Gillespie	

- What and how much should the Core Strategy say about this area?
- How should the area be shown on the Proposals Map and what area should it cover?
- What should the Core Strategy say about potential nature and scale of uses proposed?
- What should the Core Strategy say about any impact on adjoining areas and how it relates to the City and adjoining Districts?
- What should the Core Strategy say about the potential transport impacts?
- What should the Core Strategy say about the way that this project will be progressed?

5 Alternative sites

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Adrian Roche Laura Goddard	Mr Sean Feeney*
Oxfordshire Green Party	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch

- Are there any other more suitable, sustainable locations that should be identified as strategic locations or contingency sites?

**MATTER 9 - CLIMATE CHANGE
WEDNESDAY 29 JULY AT 10.00 AM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Adrian Roche Rachel Williams Richard Wyatt Simon Fox (Issue 3)	Oxfordshire Green Party
Environment Agency	New Marston (South) Residents' Association
Oxford Preservation Trust*	Mr Sean Feeney
Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch	

1 General

- Does the Core Strategy pay sufficient attention to climate change and does it clearly set out the overarching sustainability principles that should apply?
- Does it properly and fully reflect national guidance and the guidance framework set out in the RSS?

2 Energy and natural resources

- Should policy CS10 itself set out targets for energy use and carbon emissions?
- Should specific targets be identified here for the larger scale developments, such as the strategic locations?
- Could the policy be more helpful and explicit as to where and when renewable energy developments would be permitted?

3 Flooding

- Does the plan's approach to flood risk accord with guidance in PPS25, particularly in respect of the sequential and exceptions tests?
- How has the SFRA influenced the spatial strategy?
- Is the SFRA based upon the most up to date information?
- Should the plan be more specific as to what is required to avoid unacceptable flood risk?
- Should the plan include more detailed mapping and information?

**MATTER 10- THE NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENTS
WEDNESDAY 29 JULY AT 11.30 AM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Adrian Roche Nick Worlledge Richard Wyatt	CPRE (Oxfordshire/Oxford District)
Natural England	Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
Oxfordshire County Council	New Marston Wildlife Group
Oxfordshire Green Party	Southfield Golf Club/ Mr R J Davies
Christ Church	Mrs S Benfield
Oxford City and County Archaeological Forum/ Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society	Mr Sean Feeney*
Oxford Preservation Trust	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch
Headington & St Clements Residents' Associations	

1 The natural environment

- How does the plan meet its obligations in terms of its internationally protected habitats?
- Is the plan's approach appropriate and does it provide a realistic and sound basis to enable development to proceed without significant adverse effect upon the protected areas?
- Does the Core Strategy give proper and appropriate recognition to all the other important areas of nature conservation?
- Should more sites be identified and included for protection?
- Is the approach of the Core Strategy to open space and recreation the most appropriate and does it recognise all those areas that should be protected?

2 The built environment

- Does the Core Strategy give proper and appropriate recognition to the exceptional quality of much of the built environment including the historic environment and views?
- Is the level of guidance given appropriate for this Core Strategy?

**MATTER 11 – MONITORING
WEDNESDAY 29 JULY AT 2.00 PM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Adrian Roche Matthew Bates	ENGAGE
Mr Sean Feeney*	Oxfordshire Green Party

- Are the targets appropriate, sufficiently detailed and of an appropriate time scale?
- Are all areas sufficiently covered by indicators and targets?

**OTHER MATTERS
WEDNESDAY 29 JULY AT 3.00 PM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Adrian Roche Tim Hunter	British Waterways*
Mr Sean Feeney*	Friends of Oxford Canal Terminal

- Should the Core Strategy include the potential for use of Oxford's waterways for residential purposes?

**OTHER MATTERS
WEDNESDAY 29 JULY AT 4.00 PM**

Participants

Oxford City Council Mark Jaggard Adrian Roche Tim Hunter	Councillor Nuala Young
Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch	Headington & St Clements Residents' Associations
Friends of Warneford Meadow	

- Should Policy CS22 include for the provision of a range of leisure, sport and recreation activities?

MATTER 8A NORTHERN GATEWAY Policy CS6

Revised agenda

For 10th and 11th September 2009

10.00 am Oxford Town Hall

We have in previous hearing sessions considered issues related to the housing and jobs balance, the overall amount of housing and the overall amount of employment in terms of jobs and land that should be provided in Oxford through to 2026. We have also considered broad issues related to the green belt and the process by which this site was identified, together with its appropriateness in general terms.

I intend to cover the following matters, set out below, at our resumed sessions on Thursday 10th and Friday 11th September. Please note, I have previously received position statements in respect of the inclusion of the Northern Gateway site in the Core Strategy, as a strategic site. It is not necessary for participants to submit any further papers in respect of this remaining, revised Agenda. There will be adequate time over the 2 allocated days for those who have a place round the table to present their evidence orally.

Participants

Oxford City Council Michael Crofton-Briggs Mark Jaggard Tom Morris	Kier Property/Worcester College, Merton College and Goodman
Oxfordshire CC	Merton College (joint statement with Goodman et al)
South Oxfordshire DC	ENGAGE
Highways Agency	Oxford Preservation Trust
CPRE	Councillor McCready
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	Oxfordshire Green Party
Natural England	Mr Sean Feeney
Councillor Fooks	Bus Users UK, Oxford Branch
Dr Evan Harris MP	Wolvercote Commoners' Committee

1 The land available

What land may be available for development in the Northern Gateway area in addition to the safeguarded land?

What is its current usage and likely availability?

What exceptional circumstances exist that might justify expanding the site to include land that is currently part of the green belt?

How best should the extent of the site be shown in the plan and on the Proposals Map?

2 The current proposals

What are the current proposals and what should policy CS6 say about this – should it be more or less specific about the mix of uses?

- Employment
- Residential
- Emergency services
- Hotel
- Retail
- Other

What is the likely number of jobs that would be created by the development? How does this relate to the workforce/jobs balance?

What is the current programme for development should the Core Strategy support its development?

3 Constraints to development

In respect of items 3.1 to 3.5 below:

What are the problems that would need to be resolved if the development could go ahead? What infrastructure and mitigation measures would be required to resolve these problems? What requirements, if any, should be specified in the policy before an acceptable development could be achieved?

3.1 Access and highways

Does the location of this site conflict with the guidance in PPG13? What are the current highway problems in this area?

How much traffic would be generated by the development? How would this be likely to be spread across the highway network? What split between car/public transport/cycling/walking is envisaged?

Without any mitigation measures, what impact would this have on the existing conditions?

What infrastructure and mitigation measures would therefore be needed to enable Northern Gateway to proceed?

What is the position of the Access to Oxford transport package, in terms of funding and relationship to this scheme? Is it correct to say the Access to Oxford strategy is related to current problems and issues of general growth in traffic and is not specifically intended to address the impact of this strategic site? What is the likelihood of the Access to Oxford transport package being implemented? When would this happen? What are the implications of a funding shortfall?

What mitigation measures would be necessary to accommodate the Northern Gateway development, without unacceptably harming the flow and safety of traffic on the highway network?

Does the Northern Gateway development accord with policy CS14 in terms of giving priority to walking, cycling and public transport? How can this be achieved? What car parking should be permitted on site? What is the relationship between the development and the Park and Ride site?

What specific requirements could and should be built in to policy CS6 to control the level of traffic generation and ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are put in place?

Should some land be safeguarded for future strategic highway network improvements/rapid transit proposals?

3.2 Residential amenity

What residential areas are likely to be affected by the Northern Gateway development?

How, and in what way, are they likely to be affected?

What measures could minimise any impact on those living nearby?
Can rat-running be avoided?

3.3 Natural habitats

Does the land at Northern Gateway have any merit in natural habitat terms?

Is there likely to be any harm caused to the designated Oxford Meadows? If so, can this be acceptably mitigated?

Are there any other habitat concerns?

3.4 Air Quality

What is the likely impact on air quality in this area and beyond?
Can any harmful impact be successfully mitigated?

3.5 Other considerations

Are there any other concerns, such as availability of schooling locally?
If so, can these be appropriately overcome?

4 Phasing

Are there any grounds for phasing the development?
If so, what sort of phasing?

5 What happens to the Core Strategy if the development cannot be accommodated successfully?

Is there a Plan B?

6 If the development is to be part of the Council's strategy to 2026, how best should it be progressed?

What level of detail is appropriate for inclusion in this Core Strategy?

Is an Area Action Plan the proper way to progress the detailed implementation of this scheme?