

Background paper 004a

Title: Key Employment Sites Methodology

This paper sets out the approach and methodology that was undertaken in developing the city's Key Employment Sites.

Relevant Local Plan 2045 Objective(s):

- Maximise the benefits of the city's strengths in knowledge, healthcare and education while supporting economic growth in key sectors including science and innovation.
- Recognise the valuable contribution that supporting a range of businesses (including SMEs) can make to innovation and economic diversity. Help to create the conditions in which all businesses can prosper.
- Create opportunities for everyone in the city to access employment. Support local people giving them access to training, education and apprenticeships to make the most out of new job opportunities created in the city.
- Help Oxford to continue in its role as a national and international destination and support the visitor economy by encouraging longer stays and higher spend in Oxford.

Relevant SA Objective(s):

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.

SEA theme(s): Population and material assets.

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Methodology for Site Selection	2
Development of the Employment Site Assessment Pro-Forma	2
Employment site identification process	2
Identified employment sites: initial site size filter.....	2
Employment site assessments.....	3
How the Key Employment Sites were identified	3
Key Employment Sites: consideration of emerging Local Plan 2045 policy framework.....	5
3. Oxford's Key Employment Sites	8
Appendix 1: Employment Site Assessment Pro-Forma	9
Appendix 2: Guidance Notes for Pro-Forma.....	15
Appendix 3 – List of sites assessed using the Pro-Forma.....	18

Appendix 4 – Final scores for assessed sites..... 20

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This background paper focuses on providing an explanation of the approach and methodology undertaken in developing the policy for, and identifying, the city's Key Employment Sites.
- 1.2. It does not seek to simply repeat the content of sections of *Background Paper 004: Employment and Inclusive Economy*. Instead, it supplements existing information. As such, it does not follow the same structure.
- 1.3. The aim of this Background Paper is to provide the reader with a clear understanding of the process that was undertaken in the selection of Oxford's Key Employment Sites.

2. Methodology for Site Selection

Development of the Employment Site Assessment Pro-Forma

- 2.1. The first step in the process was the development of Site Assessment Pro-Forma. The Pro-Forma (re-produced at Appendix 1) was developed in consultation with the consultant team employed by the City Council to undertake the Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) – drawing on their many years of experience in undertaking Employment Land and Economic Need Assessments for Local Authorities.
- 2.2. The Pro-Forma consists of two sections. The first part is a desktop assessment and the second, an on-site assessment. City Council officers undertook the individual site assessments, using the guidance notes as set out at Appendix 2.
- 2.3. However, before the site visits were carried out, a list of employment sites that required assessment was compiled. The employment site identification process is discussed in the next section.

Employment site identification process

- 2.4. A range of sources was used to compile the list of employment sites that were assessed using the Pro-Forma including:
 - Category 1 and Category 2 Employment Sites (Local Plan 2036 Policy E1)
 - Oxford Local Plan 2036 site allocations for employment uses
 - "Key Protected Employment Sites" which were the subject of the historic Article 4 Direction (2014)
 - Local Plan 2045 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and its predecessor, the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, which considered the suitability of sites for housing and economic uses.
- 2.5. This identification process uncovered 172 potential employment sites for further consideration.

Identified employment sites: initial site size filter

- 2.6. The first step in the assessment process was the application of an initial site size filter. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) Paragraph 009 Reference ID 3-009-20190722 suggests using a site area of 0.25ha (or 500 square metres of floorspace) when undertaking assessments of economic land.
- 2.7. City Council Officers discussed the use of a threshold with the appointed ELNA consultants. The consultants confirmed that the use of a site size threshold was consistent with other work they had undertaken and considered the 0.25ha threshold suitable for application in this instance.
- 2.8. As site size information was readily available in hectares (as opposed to floorspace) for the sites, the City Council concluded that use of a 0.25ha minimum site size threshold was appropriate.
- 2.9. The site size filter was then applied to the 172 potential sites. 113 sites were below the threshold, leaving 59 sites for further consideration.

Employment site assessments

- 2.10. Prior to undertaking the site assessments using the Pro-Forma, a sense check was undertaken by City Council officers. This sense-check resulted in the removal of duplicate entries, for instance, where several individual but adjacent employment sites were listed in addition to the collective larger employment area (i.e. making sure that component parts were not double counted as part of a larger area). In this case, the smaller duplicate entries were removed.
- 2.11. Sites were also removed from the assessment where there was no reasonable prospect of employment-related uses coming forward in the plan period (i.e., where sites had previously been redeveloped for housing).
- 2.12. This process left 50 sites which were then assessed using the Pro-Forma. Appendix 3 provides a list of the sites assessed.
- 2.13. City Council Officers undertook site visits during Spring 2025.
- 2.14. Each site was scored using the Pro-Forma (Appendix 1) using the Guidance Note (Appendix 2) to ensure a consistent approach. The scores therefore reflect a snapshot of each employment site at the time the site visit was undertaken.
- 2.15. Appendix 4 provides a summary of the scores attained for each site.

How the Key Employment Sites were identified

2.16. Having collated the results from the site assessments, the next step towards establishing the Key Employment Sites involved the comparison of all sites assessed. The top scoring sites were generally larger, well-established employment sites. For instance, the top three ranked sites, Oxford Science Park, ARC Oxford and the Churchill Hospital, all have a site area of more than 20ha.

2.17. By contrast the lowest ranked sites, which include the Former Blanchford's Building Supplies site in Headington, the Dairy Depot site on the Old Abingdon Road, and the Storage Yards located on Binsey Lane, were all generally smaller sites (1ha or under) with limited, or single current or previous occupiers.

2.18. A degree of professional judgement based on the collected data and qualitative considerations was used in identifying which sites were selected as Key Employment Sites. A range of factors were considered in coming to the decision. These factors included (but were not limited to):

- Local Plan 2036 Employment site category status
- Site size
- The redevelopment potential of sites within the plan-period
- The ability of sites to support a broad range of jobs
- Timing of the assessment
- The contribution made by sites to the local and/or national economy
- The ability of sites to contribute to the social value of an area
- The ability of sites to accommodate a range of occupiers

2.19. After careful consideration, on balance and in the light of the above factors, it was proposed that those sites which scored 36 points or more had a more positive alignment with the qualitative decision-making criteria.

2.20. A sense check to this approach was also undertaken, where it was observed that sites that did not qualify as Key Employment Sites were generally smaller employment sites with a single occupier or limited occupancy. It was also observed that majority of sites scoring 35 or less were those considered within the extant Local Plan 2036 policy framework, to be Category 3 employment sites (i.e., smaller, less-well located, etc.). It is worth noting at this stage, that the Pro-Forma was specifically designed to consider the site characteristics at the time it was assessed. This enables a degree of parity to be applied when comparing and ranking the site scores.

2.21. The sense check also involved consideration of the characteristics and circumstances which gave rise to the scores attained for certain individual sites. For instance, Oxford North and the Unipart site both scored 36 points in the assessment. As these sites are recognised as "Category 1" employment sites in the extant Local Plan 2036 policy framework (i.e.,

nationally or regionally important to the knowledge economy or represent significant employers or sectors within the city). As such, these two sites were considered further.

2.22. The score, particularly in the case of Oxford North, reflected the timing at which the assessment was undertaken (i.e., Spring 2025, while Phase 1A of the site was still under construction). As such, the assessment resulted in certain criteria scoring lower than if the site was operational. Given the strategic nature of Oxford North, its extant employment site status (Category 1), the ability of the site to deliver a broad range of jobs throughout the plan period (both construction and operational phase) and timing of the assessment (i.e., spring 2025, while the site was under construction), set it apart from those sites that scored 35 or below.

2.23. In the case of the Unipart site, the score also reflected the assessment as at Spring 2025. Like Oxford North, this site also has Category 1 employment site status under the extant Local Plan 2036 policy framework. While there is redevelopment potential at the site within the plan period, the scale of opportunity is yet to be quantified. Given the site's former Category 1 status, its size (circa 30ha) and the redevelopment potential of the site within the plan period, Officers considered these aspects set the site apart from the smaller sites scoring 35 or more.

2.24. As such, the city's Local Plan 2045 Key Employment Sites consisted of larger sites, all of which were able to support a broad range of jobs, or occupiers; which made a contribution to the national, or local economy; and/ or were sites that contributed to the social value of their local area. This process resulted in a list of 38 sites.

2.25. For completeness, this approach resulted in the removal of the following twelve sites which scored below the threshold adopted:

- 474 Cowley Road (Former Powell's Timber Yard)
- 79-83 Temple Road
- A.W. Clarke (Engineering) Ltd, Sandford Road
- Bossom's Boatyard, The Towing Path
- Cowley Marsh Depot, Marsh Road
- Dairy Depot, Old Abingdon Road
- Fire Station, Rewley Road
- Former Builder's Yard (Blanchford's Building Supplies)
- Harcourt House, Marston Road
- Salter Brothers Ltd, Meadow Lane
- Storage Yards Binsey Lane
- Units 1-4, 385 Cowley Road

Key Employment Sites: consideration of emerging Local Plan 2045 policy framework

2.26. The emerging Local Plan 2045 policy framework contains certain elements that apply to development proposals within the city and district centres, and others that apply specifically to Key Employment Sites.

2.27. This section provides the qualitative analysis, considering the of potential implications of the application of other policies in the emerging plan, that was undertaken in arriving an appropriate site size threshold for Key Employment Sites located within the city and district centres.

2.28. The following policies were considered as part of the analysis:

2.29. Policy S1: Spatial Strategy and Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development establishes the over-arching spatial strategy for the city. The policy sets out a number of measures to help achieve the vision and objectives of the plan.

2.30. Bullet point b) is specifically relevant to the city and district centres. It allows flexibility of uses within these locations, so that the city and district centres can respond quickly to changing needs and economic circumstances and ensure a wide mix of uses, including housing, are encouraged.

2.31. Policy E1: Employment Strategy introduces a set of criteria, designed to protect Key Employment Sites by ensuring that, where a loss of floorspace is proposed, that the employment use can be maintained, and the number of jobs in employment generating uses is retained.

2.32. Policy E2: Warehousing, Storage and Distribution Uses (hereafter 'B8 uses') focuses new B8 uses at the city's network of Key Employment Sites only, introducing specific residential amenity criteria to ensure that any B8 are delivered in a way that does not result in an adverse impact on residential amenity.

2.33. The following six employment sites (located within the city and district centres) scored 36 points or more. Table 2.1 (below) sets out the specific sites, their relative size, and the overall score achieved. All sites were located in the city centre. This table shows that that two of sites are very large (i.e., over 5ha), while the remaining four sites are all smaller sites of less than a hectare (three of which being 0.3ha).

2.34. The Plan's overarching strategy allows flexibility of uses within the city and district centres. This is so that the city and district centres can respond quickly to changing needs and circumstances and ensure that a wide range of uses, including housing, are encouraged. However, Policy E1 is designed to protect the city's network of Key Employment Sites from loss to other uses, thus reducing flexibility of uses within the city and district centres.

Table 2.1 List of employment sites located in the city and district centres

Site Name/ Address	Site size (ha)	Total score
Beaver House/ Hythe Bridge St	0.3ha	39
County Hall/ New Rd	0.3ha	40
Island site/ Park End St Hythe Bridge St	0.7ha	36
Osney Mead	17.8ha	38
Oxford Town Hall/ St. Aldate's	0.3ha	39
Oxpens/ Oxpens Rd	6.3ha	37

2.35. As such, in order to allow the flexibility of uses within the city and district centres (as set out in Policy S1) a larger site size threshold for Key Employment Sites located in the city and district centres is considered appropriate. A first stage filter was then applied.

2.36. Consideration was given to the implications of setting this initial site size threshold filter at 0.5ha or 1ha, as in reality allowing flexibility on employment sites either 0.5ha or less or 1ha or less within the city and district centres, was considered to be something that most landowners or agents would generally welcome.

2.37. If the initial site size filter is set to 0.5ha, the three smallest sites (all circa. 0.3ha) are removed from further consideration. However, if the initial site size filter is set at 1ha, one additional site (0.8ha) is also removed.

2.38. The 2ha site size threshold, however, was considered more appropriate for city and district centres. This is because Policy E2: Warehousing Storage and Distribution Uses only supports B8 uses Key Employment Sites.

2.39. Unfortunately, there is a drafting error in the first sentence of Paragraph 5.40 of Background Paper 004: Employment and Inclusive Economy, which should read as follows:

Given the premium land values associated with the prime city centre office and R&D market, it is not expected that many B8 uses would be sought in these locations.

2.40. The ability of Key Employment Sites within the city and district centres to be able to accommodate an element of small-scale B8 uses was an important consideration in coming to the site size threshold of 2ha. It was considered that, the larger sites had more potential to support an element of B8 uses than the smaller sites. Examples of B8 uses that might be considered within larger Key Employment Sites in city centre locations include sustainable last mile delivery solutions (e.g., cycle/e-bike couriers/ hubs and innovations supporting the circular economy (e.g., “reverse logistics” hubs).

2.41. The potential contribution of each site to the city's employment land supply was also a factor in determining the threshold. The ELNA recognises the contributions of each of the three largest city centre sites. The Oxpens site is likely to deliver a minimum of around 60,000sqm GIA and this is recorded within the planning commitments. While the scale of opportunity at Osney Mead was yet to be quantified, the site currently performs an important role as an Industrial Estate providing space for a variety of local businesses. At 17.8ha, it is important that the employment use of the site is maintained and that the number of jobs in employment-generating uses retained. This site clearly performs an important role in the city now and will continue to do so in the future.

2.42. The Nuffield Sites (which include the 0.7ha Island site) is a mixed-use allocation across three separate parcels, two of which are likely to be for employment generating uses. Although the ELNA suggests 28,500sqm across the sites (based on landowner consultation). Assuming that any employment floorspace was split evenly across the two parcels, this would deliver 14,250sqm at the Island site. This represents a relatively small proportion of the city's overall employment floorspace need.

2.43. As set out above, the 2ha Key Employment Site size threshold for the city and district centres was arrived at using professional judgement. It has taken into account range of qualitative factors, which stem from the importance of allowing flexibility of uses in the city and district centres.

2.44. The 2ha site size threshold was therefore considered to adequately capture the larger Key Employment Sites while also enabling a degree of flexibility to enable their redevelopment for a forward a wide mix of uses, including housing, in the city's most sustainable locations.

2.45. This approach resulted in a list of 34 sites. For completeness, the application of a 2ha site size threshold within the city and district centres resulted in the removal of the following four sites:

- Beaver House, Hythe Bridge Street
- County Hall, New Road
- Oxford Town Hall, St. Aldate's
- Island site, Park End Street

3. Oxford's Key Employment Sites

3.1. The above process results in 34 employment sites being identified as Oxford's Key Employment Sites for the purposes of the policies in the Reg. 19 Plan. These sites are therefore listed in Appendix 3.1 of the Reg. 19 Plan, are shown on the Policies Map. They are listed below:

- 496 Cowley Road
- ARC Oxford
- Ashville Way Industrial Estate, Watlington Road
- Botley Road Retail Park
- Chiltern Business Centre, Garsington Road
- Churchill Hospital
- County Trading Estate, Watlington Road
- Eastpoint Business Park
- Fenchurch Court, Bobby Fryer Close
- Horspath Industrial Estate, Pony Road
- Huw Grays (formerly Buildbase), Watlington Road
- John Radcliffe Hospital
- Jordan Hill Business Park
- Light Industrial Units, Green Road
- MINI Plant Oxford
- New Barclay House, 234 Botley Road
- Newtec Place, Magdalen Road
- Nuffield Industrial Estate, Ledgers Close
- Nuffield Orthopaedic Hospital
- Old Road Campus
- Osney Mead
- Oxford Bus Company, Cowley House, Watlington Road
- Oxford North
- Oxford Science Park
- Oxford Trade Centre, Harrow Road
- Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon Street
- Oxpens
- Radcliffe Observatory Quarter (ROQ)
- The Gallery, 54 Marston Street
- Trade City Oxford and Network Oxford
- Unipart site
- University of Oxford Science Area and Keble Road Triangle
- Warneford Hospital

3.2. Wood Centre for Innovation

Appendix 1: Employment Site Assessment Pro-Forma

Employment Sites Assessment Pro-Forma – Desktop Assessment (Part 1)	
Site name	
Site address	
Site area (hectares)	
HELAA reference number	
Site allocation (OLP2036 site reference)	
Employment Site Category	
Policy considerations	
Physical/ environmental considerations	
Current use (including use class(es))	
Planning Status (i.e., live application, under construction, permission granted, complete etc.)	
Proportion of site undeveloped/ underdeveloped with potential for intensification	

Site location plan:

Accessibility	
Q1	Access to the Strategic Road Network (qualitative assessment)
	<i>Brief description of route/ describe the path from site to SRN (e.g. does it go through LTN or residential neighbourhood or is it fairly clear vehicular route):</i>
Q2	Public transport (including rail) access
1	Poor: remote site, poor infrequent public transport access
2	Fair: more than 800m from a railway station or a frequent service bus stop
3	Good: between 400-800m from a railway station or a frequent service bus stop (4 buses per hour)
4	Very good: good access to one or more frequent service bus stops (less than 400m) / within walking distance of a railway station (less than 400m)
	<i>Notes:</i>

	Site characteristics
--	-----------------------------

Q3	Contamination (qualitative assessment)
	<i>Brief description about any known contamination or potential issues:</i>

Market Conditions	
Q4	Market Perception (sites over 0.5ha)
1	Poor: low demand, difficult to attract occupiers even with heavy marketing
2	Fair: requires strong marketing/incentives to attract new occupiers
3	Good: good demand, units don't remain unoccupied for long
4	Very good: viewed as attractive by agents/occupiers; strong demand; units rarely available/appears to be all full
	<i>Notes:</i>

Q5	Marketing evidence: what evidence is there that the site has been actively marketed? (Sites over 0.5ha only) (qualitative assessment)
	<i>Notes:</i>

Ownership and potential for development	
Q6	Ownership factors (qualitative assessment)
	<i>Include any known information about ownership, e.g., site promoter, etc.):</i>

Q7	Availability for development/ redevelopment/ intensification
1	Poor: constraints on development or owner aspirations for other uses, history of non-take-up, unlikely to be available for additional employment within 5 years or more
2	Fair: no active discussions but no specific constraints to development either.
3	Good: landowner actively pursuing / discussing future investment (e.g., consultation events; known intentions to develop in short-term – i.e., within five years)
4	Very good: land likely to be available for development/ occupation within immediate term (i.e., 1-2 years) (recent grant of planning permission/ current 'live' planning application)
	<i>Notes:</i>

Q8	What development would the landowner/developer consider/propose (housing, employment, other commercial, mixed use or unknown)? (qualitative assessment)
	<i>Notes:</i>
Supports regional economic objectives (e.g., Oxford Cambridge Growth Corridor/ Enterprise Oxfordshire)	
Q9	Regional economic development opportunities

1	Poor: site does not have ability to deliver any regional economic development objectives
2	Fair: site has limited ability to deliver regional economic development objectives
3	Good: site has good ability to deliver some regional economic development objectives
4	Very good: site has excellent ability to deliver several significant regional objectives
	Notes:

Wider economic factors (Social Value)	
Q10	Deprivation and Regeneration Areas (assessed under 2019 IMD)
1	Poor: site within the most affluent neighbourhoods (super output area is in top quartile of least deprived (0-25% least deprived)
2	Fair: site within a neighbourhood ranked as average to affluent (super output area is 25-50% least deprived)
3	Good: site within a neighbourhood ranked as average to deprived (super output is in the 25%-50% most deprived)
4	Very good: site is within a neighbourhood ranked as deprived (super output area is 0-25% most deprived) and within a City Council Regeneration Area
	Notes:

Q11	Local factors
1	Poor: site does not deliver any local development objectives
2	Fair: site delivers limited number of local development objectives
3	Good: site delivers some local development objectives
4	Very good: site delivers majority of local development objectives
	Notes:

Sub-total score of desktop assessment (Part 1):

Employment Sites Assessment Pro-Forma – On-site Assessment (Part 2)

Site name	
Site address	

Accessibility

Q12 Local road access	
1	Poor: difficult/narrow road access, via residential roads, difficult site junction, congested roads or restricted heights/weights
2	Fair: some access issues as outlined above
3	Good: generally good access with few issues for HGVs and limited congestion
4	Very good: via free-moving good roads, avoiding residential areas and difficult junctions
	Notes:

Q13 Walking and Cycling	
1	Poor: no existing footpaths or cycle paths to the site
2	Fair: some footpath or cycle paths although limited provision/not continuous
3	Good: reasonable paths available but some limitations such as poor-quality surface/lighting/crossings etc.
4	Very good: good and attractive footpath and cycle links from residential areas
	Notes:

General location and neighbours

Q14 General location; proximity to amenities and facilities (and labour)	
1	Poor: remote site, no amenities or facilities easily accessible
2	Fair: limited facilities available although access may be more difficult (1-1.5 Km)
3	Good: good access to some facilities (within 0.5 -1 Km)
4	Very good: easy access to a range of amenities and facilities (within 0.5 Km)
	Notes:

Q15 Neighbouring uses (qualitative assessment)	
	<i>Describe neighbouring uses and any sensitivities they may have in relation to the site itself:</i>

Site Characteristics

Q16 Topography; size; profile	

1	Poor: sloping/uneven site; under 0.5 ha. size; irregular/narrow shape; difficult access point
2	Fair: some of the above issues
3	Good: some of the advantages below
4	Very good: generally level site; regular shape; over 2ha. in size; good access point
	Notes:

Quality of local environment	
Q17	Age of existing premises (tick as appropriate)
	Pre-1980
	1980-2010
	Post-2010
	Notes:

Q18	Condition of existing premises
1	Poor: buildings and external areas are of very poor quality and condition / very restricted circulation and servicing facilities
2	Fair: generally, buildings and external areas appear adequate, although some aspects may be poor
3	Good: generally, buildings and external areas are of good standard
4	Very good: buildings/ external areas are of a very good quality and condition providing a good range of building type, size and tenure / good circulation and servicing facilities
	Notes:

Q19	General attractiveness of location
1	Poor: surrounding environment is of poor quality; low profile/visibility; poor/run-down/unattractive appearance; attracts lower end users
2	Fair: some of the above aspects are more attractive
3	Good: most aspects are attractive though some users would likely look for a better standard
4	Very good: quality of surrounding environment will likely be a positive factor to attracting occupiers; high profile/visibility; high quality appearance, environment and quality of occupiers
	Notes:

Q20	Environmental quality
1	Poor: the site is substantially exposed to noise, dust and/or smell which significantly affects the quality of the immediate environment
2	Fair: the site is exposed to some noise, dust or smell which somewhat affects the quality of the environment at certain periods of day

3	Good: occasionally, the site is exposed to some noise, dust or smell which can affect the amenity of the immediate environment
4	Very good: the site does not appear to be exposed to unreasonable levels of noise, smell, dust or other amenity factors
	Notes:

Q21	Green and blue infrastructure (GBI) features – this could include areas of green space, trees and shrubs, ponds, canals/rivers, green walls or roofs.
1	Poor – little or no GBI features on the site. If located on site, relatively disparate and/or of low quality, the area is entirely or predominantly artificial in surface cover.
2	Fair – there are some areas of GBI features on the site, or features which seem of average quality.
3	Good – GBI covers a fairly large area of the site, or forms some good connections to neighbouring areas, or includes features which seem of a good quality.
4	Very good - GBI makes up extensive parts of the site, or forms strong connections to neighbouring areas, or includes features which seem of a very high/exceptional quality.
	Notes:

Market conditions	
Q22	Vacancy levels
1	Poor: over 25% site/premises vacant
2	Fair: 15-25% site/premises vacant
3	Good: 10-15% site/premises vacant
4	Very good: under 10% of site/premises vacant
	Notes:

Sub-total score of on-site assessment:

Total score: Desktop (part 1) and On-site (Part 2) assessment:
Notes:

Appendix 2: Guidance Notes for Pro-Forma

Employment Site Assessment Pro-Forma – Desktop Assessment (Part 1)	
Site name	
Site address	
Site area (hectares)	
HELAA reference number	
Site allocation (OLP2036)	
Category of employment site	
Policy considerations (only applies to non-SHLAA sites 0.25ha or more)	
Physical/ environmental considerations (only applies to non-SHLAA sites 0.25ha or more)	
Current use (including use class(es))	
Planning Status (e.g. under construction, has a permission in place, etc.)	
Proportion of site undeveloped/ underdeveloped with potential for intensification	

Site location plan:
<i>[Insert Site Location Plan]</i>

Section/ Question(s)	Instructions
Accessibility	
1. Access to Strategic Road network	1. Describe access from the site to the Strategic Road Network.
2. Public transport (including rail) access	2. A frequent service bus stop is one with four or more buses per hour.
Site Characteristics	
3. Contamination	3. Description of any known contamination issues.
Market Conditions	
4. Market Perception (site size 0.5ha or more)	4. Use evidence from web-searches, etc. to inform judgement about occupancy demand.
5. Marketing evidence (site size 0.5ha or more)	5. What evidence is there that the site has been actively marketed? Make a note of any commercial property lettings (e.g., from web-search) at the time of the assessment.
Ownership and potential for development	

<p>6. Ownership factors (site size 0.5ha or more)</p> <p>7. Availability for development</p> <p>8. What development would the landowner/ developer consider/ propose?</p>	<p>6. What publicly available information exists about ownership? Is there a site promoter, etc?</p> <p>7. Has there been a recent, or is there a current planning application at the site?</p> <p>8. Check call-for-sites response forms, for example.</p>
<p>Supports regional economic objectives</p> <p>9. Regional Economic Development Objectives</p>	<p>9. Regional economic objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports investment, growth and expansion of key sectors such as Science (STEM, Life Sciences etc.), and knowledge-based industries - Supports existing businesses to “scale-up” - Helps to attract new ‘high growth’ companies to Oxfordshire; - Supports investment in transport infrastructure to improve connectivity within Oxfordshire and with other major economic hubs (e.g., Cowley Branch Line, Oxford Railway Station improvements); <p>Regional Economic Factors scoring:</p> <p>1 – no objectives met</p> <p>2 – 1 objective met</p> <p>3 – 2-3 objectives met</p> <p>4 – all objectives met</p>
<p>Wider Economic Factors</p> <p>10. Deprivation and regeneration areas</p> <p>11. Local factors</p>	<p>10. Use IMD database (2019) to work out deprivation scores. A “regeneration area” in this context, is an area which scores in the top 25% ‘most-deprived’ areas in the country.</p> <p>11. Local Factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site likely to support mainly local jobs - Site likely to support mainly micro (0-9) and/ or small business(es) - Site offers opportunities for training and skills - Provides a local/ community service (i.e., repairs, recycling, etc.) <p>Local Factors scoring:</p> <p>1 – no objectives met</p> <p>2 – 1 objective met</p> <p>3 – 2-3 objectives met</p> <p>4 – 4 objectives met</p>

Employment Sites Assessment Pro-Forma – On-site Assessment (Part 2)

Accessibility 12. Local Road Access 13. Walking and Cycling	12. Assess site using specified criteria 13. Assess site using specified criteria
General location and neighbours 14. General location; proximity to amenities and facilities (and labour) 15. Proximity to incompatible uses	14. Assess site using specified criteria 15. Describe neighbouring uses and any sensitivities they may have in relation to the site.
Site characteristics 16. Topography; size; profile	16. Consider site size, shape topography and site access.
Quality of local environment 17. Age of existing premises 18. Condition of existing premises 19. General attractiveness of location 20. Environmental quality 21. Green and blue infrastructure features	17. Estimate the age of the premises. (Supplement with further desktop work if required) 18. Assess site using specified criteria 19. Assess site using specified criteria 20. Assess site using specified criteria 21. Assess site using specified criteria
Market conditions 22. Vacancy levels	22. Use existing on-site information to inform judgement (e.g., site board/ letting signs). (Supplement with further desktop analysis as required.)

Appendix 3 – List of sites assessed using the Pro-Forma

A3.1 The following sites underwent a full assessment using the Pro-Forma:

- 474 Cowley Road (Former Powell's Timber Yard)
- 496 Cowley Road
- 79-83 Temple Road
- ARC Oxford
- A.W. Clarke (Engineering) Ltd, Sandford Road
- Ashville Way Industrial Estate, Watlington Road
- Beaver House, Hythe Bridge Street
- Bossoms Boatyard
- Botley Road Retail Park
- Chiltern Business Centre, Garsington Road
- Churchill Hospital
- County Hall, New Road
- County Trading Estate, Watlington Road
- Cowley Marsh Depot
- Dairy Depot, Old Abingdon Road
- Eastpoint Business Park
- Fenchurch Court, Bobby Fryer Close
- Fire Station, Rewley Road
- Former Builder's Yard (Blanchford Building Supplies)
- Harcourt House, Marston Road
- Horspath Industrial Estate, Pony Road, Horspath
- Huw Grays (formerly Buildbase), Watlington Road
- Island Site, Park End Street
- John Radcliffe Hospital
- Jordan Hill Business Park
- Light Industrial Units, Green Road
- MINI Plant Oxford
- New Barclay House, 234 Botley Road
- Newtec Place, Magdalen Road
- Nuffield Industrial Estate, Ledgers Close
- Nuffield Orthopaedic Hospital
- Old Road Campus
- Osney Mead
- Oxford Bus Company, Cowley House, Watlington Road
- Oxford North
- Oxford Town Hall, St. Aldate's
- Oxford Trade Centre, Harrow Road
- Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon Street
- Oxpens

- Radcliffe Observatory Quarter (ROQ)
- Salter Brothers Ltd, Meadow Lane
- Storage Yards, Binsey Lane
- The Gallery, 54 Marston Street
- Oxford Science Park
- Oxford Trade City and Network Oxford
- Unipart site
- University of Oxford Science Area and Keble Road Triangle
- Warneford Hospital
- Wood Centre for Innovation

Appendix 4 – Final scores for assessed sites

Name/ Address	Ward	Site Area (ha)	Final Score
474 Cowley Road (Former Powell's Timber Yard)	Donnington	0.3	34
496 Cowley Road	Donnington	0.3	36
79-83 Temple Road	Temple Cowley	0.5	32
AW Clarke (Engineering) Ltd, Sandford Road	Littlemore	0.3	32
ARC Oxford	Temple Cowley	35.4	47
Ashville Way Industrial Estate, Watlington Road	Blackbird Leys	1.3	40
Beaver House, 28-38 Hythe Bridge Street	Carfax & Jericho	0.30	39
Bossoms Boatyard, The Towing Path, OX2	Osney & St Thomas	0.3	34
Botley Road Retail Park, Botley Road	Osney & St Thomas	8.8	41
Chiltern Business Centre, Garsington Road	Blackbird Leys	0.6	37
Churchill Hospital, Old Road, Headington	Churchill	22.7	46
County Hall, New Road	Osney & St Thomas	0.3	40
County Trading Estate, Watlington Road	Blackbird Leys	9.7	42
Cowley Marsh Depot, Marsh Road	Temple Cowley	1.7	34
Dairy Depot, Old Abingdon Road	Hinksey Park	0.8	32
Eastpoint Business Park, Sandy Lane West	Littlemore	1.5	38

Name/ Address	Ward	Site Area (ha)	Final Score
Fenchurch Court, Bobby Fryer Close, Watlington Road	Blackbird Leys	1.2	41
Fire Station, Rewley Road	Carfax & Jericho	0.5	35
Former Builder's Yard (Blanchford's) 59 Windmill Road, Headington	Headington	1.0	32
Harcourt House, Marston Road	Headington Hill & Northway	1.1	33
Horspath Industrial Estate, Pony Road	Blackbird Leys	8.3	40
Huw Grays (Formerly Buildbase), Watlington Road	Blackbird Leys	2.2	36
Island Site, Park End Street/ Hythe Bridge Street	Osney & St Thomas	0.7	36
John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way	Headington Hill & Northway/ Headington	27.8	37
Light Industrial Units, Green Road	Quarry & Risinghurst	1.5	36
MINI Plant Oxford	Blackbird Leys	82.1	38
New Barclay House, 234 Botley Road	Osney & St Thomas	0.3	41
Newtec Place, Magdalen Road	St Marys	0.4	36
Nuffield Industrial Estate, Ledgers Close	Littlemore	1.7	39
Nuffield Orthopaedic Hospital	Churchill	8.4	42
Old Road Campus	Churchill	6.4	44
Osney Mead	Osney & St Thomas	17.8	38
Oxford Bus Company, Cowley House, Watlington Road	Blackbird Leys	1.6	38
Oxford North	Cuttleslowe & Sunnymead	16.4	38
Oxford Science Park	Littlemore	27.1	49
Oxford Town Hall	Holwell	0.3	39

Name/ Address	Ward	Site Area (ha)	Final Score
Oxford Trade Centre, Harrow Road	Blackbird Leys	0.8	38
Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon Street	Carfax & Jericho	2.1	42
Oxpens, Oxpens Road	Osney & St Thomas	6.3	37
Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road	Walton Manor	4.2	45
Salter Brothers, Meadow Lane site	Donnington	1.3	35
Storage Yards, Binsey Lane	Osney & St Thomas	0.4	30
The Gallery, 54 Marston Street	St Marys	0.3	36
Trade City and Network Oxford, Sandy Lane West	Littlemore	2.8	37
Unipart site	Watlington Road	30.6	36
Units 1-4, 385 Cowley Road	Donnington	0.3	32
University of Oxford Science Area and Keble Road Triangle	Holywell/ Walton Manor	12.4	37
Warneford Hospital	Churchill	8.8	41
Wood Centre for Innovation	Quarry and Risinghurst	0.8	40