Appendix A – Detailed SA appraisal of select policy options sets

Policy Options set 001a: Housing requirement for the plan period

Policy options considered:

- **Option a:** Set a housing requirement in the Plan based on the full housing need identified through the Standard Method (c.21,740 dwellings over the Plan period 2022-2042).
- **Option b:** Set a housing requirement lower than the need identified by the Standard Method, based on capacity calculated in accordance with the spatial strategy (c.9,800 dwellings over the Plan period 2022-2042).
- **Option c:** Set a housing requirement higher than the standard method in order to support economic growth or affordable housing need, even though achieving this requirement would rely on delivery outside of Oxford's boundaries.

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Additional Remarks
1. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040.	--	-	--	Carbon impacts likely to arise from all options without additional mitigation, though more housing in city may reduce in-commuting and reduce transport emissions.
2. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	**--** To meet the higher housing requirement, the Council will need to take a more relaxed approach to constraints – potentially developing more green spaces, areas of flood risk.	**0** Takes into account constraints like flood risk, green space etc.	**--** To meet the higher housing requirement, the Council will need to take a more relaxed approach to constraints – potentially developing more green spaces, areas of flood risk.	

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Additional Remarks
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land.	**?** Might allow more efficiency in terms of higher capacity, but potentially sacrificing other uses like green space etc	**?** Arguably most efficient approach as capacity approach would mean still seeking to max out the developable land on sites, but also providing for open space, green infrastructure etc to meet other objectives.	**?** Might allow more efficiency in terms of higher capacity, but potentially sacrificing other uses like green space etc	Ultimately, depends upon implementation
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home.	**++** The Government's Standard Method identifies housing need in the absence of other locally specific factors.	**+** Does depend upon implementation, likely does not meet housing need in full within the city, but attempts will be made to meet unmet need elsewhere. Will however still make a substantial contribution to housing need.	**++** Depends upon implementation, would likely bring forward more housing in the city to meet need, however trying to meet a global number this could come at expense of meeting other specific local needs (e.g. family dwellings,).	
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**.	**?**	**?**	**?**	Depends upon implementation for all options. Depends where in the city the housing comes forward, also the tenure of the housing (e.g. how much is affordable etc). More housing isn't necessarily going to help inequality alone.

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Additional Remarks
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**.	**?**	**?**	**?**	Depends upon implementation, new housing should come alongside provision for facilities/services (e.g. developer contributions/CIL). However, nature of city means many small sites that limits opportunities to provide for new services/facilities, leading to cummulative impacts.
7. To provide adequate **green infrastructure, leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all.	**-** More pressure on existing sites and potentially more loss of green sites.	**0** Wouldn't be delivering new GI, however potentially more space on sites to incorporate GI – however this is likely to be more about mitigation of impact.	**-** More pressure on existing sites and potentially more loss of green sites.	
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry.	**-?** More people in the city with some associated increase in cars. Though potentially more workers able to live closer to employment reducing in-commuting generated.	**+/-** Would help to reduce the imbalance between those working in Oxford but being forced to live further afield. More people accommodated in the city and likely some increase in cars	**-?** More people in the city and going beyond need to support growth. Though potentially more workers able to live closer to employment reducing in-commuting generated.	Complex topic to score due to varying factors that could impact traffic/emissions. Generally it is assumed emissions related to transport will reduce as private vehicles move away from fossil fuels and air quality measures

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Additional Remarks
		(though to lesser degree than other options).		in the city continue to have positive effects.
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources.	**--** More people means more demand for water and more pressure on wastewater.	**+/-** More people means more demand for water and more pressure on wastewater. Capacity approach, would include scope to incorporate buffers to streams and other mitigations etc.	**--** More people means more demand for water and more pressure on wastewater.	All options would put additional stress on the water environment.
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**.	**-?** Does depend upon implementation – development would deliver net gain, might not be within the city. If more sites are used for development, even less opportunity to deliver net gain in city (or protect informally important biodiversity sites).	**0** Does depend upon implementation – development would deliver net gain, but might not be within the city. But would allow protection of a network of green sites important for supporting biodiversity, and may enable developments to better mitigate impacts on biodiversity or to accommodate more biodiversity features.	**-?** Does depend upon implementation – development would deliver net gain, might not be within the city. If more sites are used for development, even less opportunity to deliver net gain in city (or protect informally important biodiversity sites).	Assume that net gain is requirement regardless of local policy.
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the	**--** Will depend on implementation to some degree, however, assuming a more	**0** Capacity is based on taking into account considerations like impact on heritage. More	**--** Will depend on implementation to some degree, however, assuming a more	

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Additional Remarks
historic environment and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	minimal approach to heritage considerations and wider place-making choices in order to maximise capacity of sites which could lead to harm to assets onsite and nearby.	scope to incorporate other features to support good urban design.	minimal approach to heritage considerations and wider place-making choices in order to maximise capacity of sites which could lead to harm to assets onsite and nearby.	
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector.	**+/++** Will make some contribution to economic growth by adding to housing and reducing barrier to employment in city, though some employment sites could be lost to housing.	**+** Will make some contribution to economic growth by adding to housing.	**++** Aims to provide enough homes for high economic growth, however, some employment sites could be lost to housing	

Conclusions/potential mitigation needed

Options A and C have some significant benefits for supporting housing and the economy but also come at the cost of more significant negative impacts against various other objectives. Option B would have positive impacts for housing and economy as it would still make an important contribution to housing need, though to a lesser degree than the other options, but it also incurs much less in the way of negative impacts for other objectives because of the capacity-based approach that drives it. Depending on the option selected, mitigation will be necessary in relation to carbon emissions, water and potentially traffic/air pollution (though this is less certain as impacts are hard to judge). Were options a or c to be selected, additio nal

mitigation would need to be considered for a range of other areas including in relation to design/heritage, biodiversity, green infrastructure and climate resilience.

Policy Options set 002e: Employer-linked affordable housing

Policy options considered:

- **Option a:** On specified sites listed in the Plan, allow developments of homes that are available only for employees who work for a specific listed organisations at an affordable rent level (as agreed with the local authority).
- **Option b:** Do not include an employer linked housing policy.

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Additional Remarks
1. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040.	**N/A**	**N/A**	
2. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	**N/A**	**N/A**	
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land.	**+** Potentially may lead to more efficiently using sites, or parts of sites, that would otherwise not come forward.	**0**	
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home.	**++** Would bring forward housing on sites that would not otherwise come forward, though this may not be available to	**0**	

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Additional Remarks
	everyone, it would still meet an identified need.		
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**.	**+** The sites would not otherwise be providing any housing. Whilst the affordable housing that would come forward might not be social rented housing, it would still be affordable rent set at a level agreed with the Council.	**0**	
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**.	N/A	N/A	
7. To provide adequate **green infrastructure, leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all.	N/A	N/A	
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry.	**+** Depends upon implementation (e.g. who the units are offered to), but is likely to support this criteria (e.g. reducing car travel – and some people would be housed on site).	**0**	
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources.	N/A	N/A	

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Additional Remarks
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**.	N/A	N/A	
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	N/A	N/A	
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector.	**++** Part of the purpose of the policy is to support recruitment and retention of employees for key employment sectors.	**0**	

Conclusions/potential mitigation needed

Option a has greater positive sustainability impacts than option b. The assessment does not identify any obvious requirement for mitigations to be factored in alongside either option.

Policy Options set 003a: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

Policy options considered:

- **Option a:** Prevent a concentration of HMOs in any area by only allowing a certain percentage of HMOs within a frontage or radius (currently this is 20%).

- **Option b:** Allow new purpose-built HMOs in appropriate locations, (potentially restricting the size of these in particular areas).
- **Option c:** Concentrate HMOs in certain areas so there is no restriction in particular areas and a complete or near complete restriction in others.
- **Option d:** Do not have any restriction on HMOs.

Option B is not really an alternative to the other options, but rather an additional element that could be incorporated alongside either option A, C or D.

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
1. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Potentially, option b and d could encourage more HMOs which would be denser development – potentially better for emissions – same energy source? Very indirect.
2. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land**	+	+	+	+	New HMOs or converting existing

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land.					homes would be positive for efficient use of land. HMOs are generally a very space-efficient way to house people.
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home.	**+/-** This is potentially helping to protect the existing mix of housing sizes and types (e.g. family dwelling), but also allowing HMOs to come forward.	**+/-** This option could meet certain communities' needs but these would be competing with others.	**+/-** This is potentially helping to protect the existing mix of housing sizes and types (e.g. family dwelling), but also allowing HMOs to come forward.	**-** In some areas it wouldn't make a difference, but in other areas there is likely to be a signficant amount coming forward in others at the expense of meeting other local housing needs.	Anecdotally, there appears to be some demand for this type of accommodation, but it is not measured explicitly. All options could meet certain community's needs, but it would compete with other types of housing need.
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**.	**0**	**+?** Purpose-built HMOs can provide a better quality of environment for residents and neighbours – planning can influence the 'healthiness' that is	**0**	**0**	Some of the health impacts are controlled by a separate regulatory regime (selective licensing). Planning can control the design elements.

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
		designed into the development.			
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Potentially, more HMOs/higher density means more people and more pressure on existing services. Cumulative impact as they are not contributing to provision.
7. To provide adequate **green infrastructure, leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Potentially, more HMOs/higher density means more people and more pressure on existing green infrastructure/spaces. Cumulative impact as they are not contributing to provision.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	**0** The use of a threshold would prevent an overconcentration of HMOs in any one area, limiting the negative impacts to amenity/local character etc.	**+/-?** Uncertain, could result in more HMOs coming forward with associated negative impacts on local amenity, though depends upon implementation, however, new build gives the opportunity to tailor the design to mitigate impacts.	**-?** Very much depends upon implementation. This option could lead to some neighbourhoods becoming inappropriately dominated – although the policy can control which areas – losing some local character where significant numbers of new HMOs come forward whilst others maintain theirs.	**-** Depends upon implementation but likely more negative. This option could lead to any of the neighbourhoods becoming inappropriately dominated, losing some local character where significant numbers of new HMOs come forward whilst others maintain theirs.	Scoring against this criterion considers the potential harmful urban design impacts that can arise from HMOs such as bins, bicycles, car parking etc.
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and					

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector.					

Conclusions/potential mitigation needed

Option A and C both perform better in sustainability impacts than option D, though there is some additional uncertainty with elements of option C compared with A, which could result in additional negative impact under obj 11. Option B does potentially have additional positive impacts in regard to obj 5, but this is an additional option (rather than an alternative approach that can be directly compared with the other options). The assessment does not identify any obvious requirement for mitigations to be factored in alongside either option.

Policy Options set 003b: Location of new student accommodation

Policy options considered:

- **Option a**: Restrict the locations where new student accommodation would be allowed to: on or adjacent to existing or campus sites, existing student accommodation sites, district centres and the city centre (or potentially only parts of these or some of these) and existing student accommodation.
- **Option b**: Restrict the locations where new student accommodation would be allowed to: existing campus sites, existing student accommodation sites, district centres, the city centre and on arterial roads.
- **Option c**: Have no locational restriction on student accommodation but a criteria-based policy.
- **Option d**: Allow new student accommodation only on existing campus sites and on existing student accommodation sites.

The options set included additional options (Options E, F and G), which are not incorporated into the detailed appraisal as they address options for management of student accommodation, rather than options for spatial approach to location of this type of use, which was considered to be the area where there could be significant effects that needed to be investigated further.

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Additional Remarks
1. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
2. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land.	**0**	**0**	**0** Would depend upon implementation. Would apply to campus sites or not – might encourage more efficient use of campuses.	**?** Potentially encourages more efficient use of institutional land and university-owned sites where space on the campus would be forced to be maximised – which might not	

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Additional Remarks
				otherwise be the case.	
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home.	**+/-** Potentially meets more of the student housing need but this would be balanced out against not meeting/losing housing provision for other housing need.	**+/-** Potentially meets more of the student housing need (and slightly more than option a) but this would be balanced out against not meeting/losing housing provision for other housing need.	**+/-** Potentially allows more student accommodation to come forward and meet needs, but would likely be competing with meeting other housing needs which might not be met as a result.	**+/-** Potentially means not meeting full student housing need but would ensure other housing needs outside campus sites is not lost to student accommodation.	Essentially it is a balance between opening up more sites to meet specialist housing need (students) and restricting it to preserve accommodation for wider housing need.
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
7. To provide adequate **green infrastructure, leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air**	**+**	**+**	**-**	**+**	

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Additional Remarks
pollution by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry.	Depends upon implementation, most locations will be accessible to public transport/active travel (potentially not all of the student accommodation sites)	Depends upon implementation, most locations will be accessible to public transport/active travel (potentially not all of the student accommodation sites)	Potentially means student accommodation in inaccessible sites e.g. edge of city. Potentially forces reliance on private vehicles.	Depends upon implementation, some locations will be more accessible to public transport/active travel than others.	
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and	**+** Limits new accommodation to the areas that can arguably most-easily accommodate without additional harm to amenity.	**-** The addition of arterial routes allows the risk of long stretches of student accommodation to develop, negatively impacting amenity of the area.	**?** Depends upon implementation – could result in negative impacts as not preventing over-concentration.	**+** Generally, more positive, ensuring that student accommodation is located on the main university campuses, although potentially some negative impact where some	

SA objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Additional Remarks
promoting innovation.				student accommodation is outside the campuses.	
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Conclusions/potential mitigation needed

Options A and D scored fairly similarly in terms of impact, with slight nuances in the underlying impact against each SA objective, whilst options B and C had additional negative impacts.

Policy Options set 008c: Retrofitting existing buildings including heritage assets

Policy options considered:

- **Option a:** Include a presumption in favour of retrofit measures for all existing buildings that are not heritage assets or in the setting of, subject to certain conditions, where these measures secure demonstrable carbon reduction/energy efficiency/climate adaptation.

- **Option b:** In relation to designated heritage assets and historic buildings, or proposals within conservation areas, set out that carbon reduction/ energy efficiency/climate adaptation measures will be considered as public benefits that may outweigh harm. Be explicit in setting out some key principles to follow, including the need for taking a Whole Building Approach to retro-fit. Expand on guidance through a Technical Advice Note.
- **Option c:** In relation to designated heritage assets and historic buildings, or proposals within conservation areas, set out that carbon reduction/ energy efficiency/climate adaptation measures will be considered as public benefits that may outweigh harm. Be explicit in setting out some key principles to follow, including the need for taking a Whole Building Approach to retro-fit. Additionally, set out in the policy the retro-fit measures that would be more or less likely to cause harm (e.g. permanent versus temporary), and how levels of harm would be assessed against public benefit. Expand on guidance through a Technical Advice Note.
- **Option d:** Do not include policy addressing retrofitting of existing buildings and/or heritage assets.

For the purposes of this assessment, options B and C are considered similar enough to be appraised together (the key difference is in how prescriptive the guidance around retro-fit measures would be in the policy wording, option B only setting key principles guiding design of retro-fit, option C going further and identifying specific measures that would be considered more/less harmful).

SA objective	Option A	Option B/C	Option D	Additional Remarks
1. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040.	**+** Would support energy efficiency/carbon reduction measures in existing non-heritage buildings	**+** Would support energy efficiency/carbon reduction measures in heritage assets, historic buildings etc. (with some constraints)	**0** No explicit local support for energy efficiency/carbon reduction retro-fit.	
2. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting	**+** Would support climate resilience measures in existing non-heritage buildings	**+** Would support climate resilience measures in heritage assets, historic buildings etc. (with some constraints)	**0** No explicit local support for climate resilience retro-fit.	

SA objective	Option A	Option B/C	Option D	Additional Remarks
detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.				
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land.	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home.	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**.	**+** Helps to make existing homes more liveable and (over time) more affordable – particularly in terms of lowering energy bills/reducing exposure to fuel poverty.	**+** Helps to make existing homes that are also older buildings more liveable and (over time) more affordable – particularly in terms of lowering energy bills/reducing exposure to fuel poverty.	**0**	
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**.	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	

SA objective	Option A	Option B/C	Option D	Additional Remarks
7. To provide adequate **green infrastructure, leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all.	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry.	**+** Heating systems (e.g. boilers) are a source of some of the pollutants contributing to poor air quality in the city. Where retro-fit drives replacements in boilers to electric systems this will have some limited positive impacts in helping to reduce this source of pollution.	**+** Heating systems (e.g. boilers) are a source of some of the pollutants contributing to poor air quality in the city. Where retro-fit drives replacements in boilers to electric systems this will have some limited positive impacts in helping to reduce this source of pollution.	**0**	
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the	**0** Some retrofit measures (e.g. solar panels, small wind turbines) have the potential to change the	**-?** Some retrofit measures are incompatible with heritage assets, listed buildings etc. The impact	**0**	

SA objective	Option A	Option B/C	Option D	Additional Remarks
historic environment and heritage assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.	character of a neighbourhood, although this impact is likely to be insignificant outside conservation areas etc.	would depend on the specific implementation of the principles/requirements in the policy.		
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector.	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Conclusions/potential mitigation needed

Option A and B/C both have positive impacts against a number of criteria. Option B/C may have negative impacts in terms of urban design/historic environment, though this depends on how retro-fit schemes are implemented. Mitigation for this impact could be achieved through a robust set of principles/guidance as part of the policy or in supporting guidance.

Policy Options set 012d: Motor vehicle parking design standard

Policy options considered:

- **Option a:** Seek low car residential development across the city, subject to criteria to ensure accessibility to public transport and local shops. Consideration will be given in the policy to setting a threshold for the numbers of pooled

cars/ car club spaces because larger sites have more scope for successful carpooling and more space for essential vehicles.

- **Option b:** Adopt parking standards for residential developments
- **Option c:** Seek low car non-residential development across the city. This could vary by accessibility of the area of the city and/or existing parking levels.
- **Option d:** Adopt parking standards for non-residential developments

For this appraisal, options b and d which refer to parking standards, assumes the Council would apply County standards. This means that for residential, there will be more parking provision per household (e.g. one space per dwelling) than the low car option. For non-residential development, the standards seek car free development or operational use only with supporting evidence, which means applicants are able to justify higher levels of provision according to their site's needs which can result in significantly more provision – so it will depend upon implementation.

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
1. To achieve the city's ambition to reach net zero **carbon emissions** by 2040.	**+**	**-**	**+**	**+/-?**	Low car would achieve significant reductions in car parking (and transport emissions). Parking standards would result in more car parking for resi, but for non-resi, impact is less certain as car free would have positive impact, but applicants could justify higher levels of provision (so it depends upon implementation).

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
2. To build **resilience to climate change**, including reducing risks from overheating, flooding and the resulting detriment to well-being, the economy and the environment.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
3. To encourage the **efficient use of land** through good design and layout, and minimise the use of greenfield and Green Belt land.	**+**	**-**	**+**	**+/-?**	Low car standards mean that applicants will need to give proper and adequate consideration as to where the car parking should be located in the most efficient way. Parking standards will result in more land being used for car parking which is inefficient, but for non-resi, impact is less certain as car free would have positive impact, but applicants could

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
					justify higher levels of provision (so it depends upon implementation).
4. To meet **local housing needs** by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home.	**+/-?** Low car may provide more space for housing, however the space may be used for other uses. Equally, low car could impact viability of some schemes and ability to deliver affordable housing although the evidence for this is complex and uncertain.	0	0	0	
5. To reduce poverty, social exclusion, and health **inequalities**.	**-?** Even though low car would allow some spaces for operational needs (e.g. those who need a car for work), it might not provide enough spaces. Typically, many such jobs that rely on a car are low paid, so	0	0	0	

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
	could negatively impact this group. However, does depend upon implementation of each scheme (and who is occupying).				
6. To provide accessible essential **services and facilities**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
7. To provide adequate **green infrastructure, leisure and recreation** opportunities and make these readily accessible for all.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Depends upon implementation, less land used for car parking may have benefits if the space is used for more greening/biodiversity.
8. To reduce **traffic and associated air pollution** by improving travel choice, shortening journeys and reducing the need to travel by car/ lorry.	**+**	**-**	**+**	**+/-?**	Low car would achieve significant reductions in car parking (and transport emissions/congestion). Parking standards would be county standards, which would result in more car parking

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
					for resi, but for non-resi, impact is less certain, as car free would have positive impact, but applicants could justify higher levels of provision (so it depends upon implementation).
9. To achieve **water** quality targets and manage water resources.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
10. To conserve and enhance Oxford's **biodiversity**.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Depends upon implementation, less land used for car parking may have benefits if the space is used for more greening/biodiversity.
11. To promote **good urban design** through the protection and enhancement of the **historic environment** and heritage	**+**	**-**	**+**	**+/-?**	Low car standards mean that applicants will need to give proper and adequate consideration as to where the car parking should be located in the most

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
assets while respecting local character and context and promoting innovation.					efficient way (including making space for active/sustainable transport measures) which should benefit urban design. Parking standards will result in more land being used for car parking which is inefficient, though again, impact for non-resi is less certain depending on if car free is delivered or not.
12. To achieve sustainable inclusive **economic growth**, including the development and expansion of a diverse and knowledge-based economy and the culture/leisure/ visitor sector.	**0**	**0**	**+/-?** Low car may provide more space for employment uses, however the space may be used for other uses. Equally, low car could impact viability of some schemes including new developments although the evidence for this is complex and uncertain. It will also	**0**	

SA objective	Option a	Option b	Option c	Option d	Additional Remarks
			depend upon implementation and the specifics of the site.		

Conclusions/potential mitigation needed

Options A and C are score most positively against the SA objectives. Option B has negative impacts against some of the criteria, potentially allowing additional cars than the low car options which could have some congestion impacts and emissions, though in relation to emissions these are likely to reduce in the long term as transport decarbonises. Option D is uncertain because it allows applicants to justify car requirements which may result in additional vehicles (or may result in fewer vehicles where car free development is delivered), it depends on implementation.